Class E380
Book .U57
2d.set

UNITED STATES TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*,

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, MARCH 1, 1828. No. 1.

[From the Kentucky Argus.]

TO THE PEOPLE OF KENTUCKY.

FRANKFORT, February 19, 1828.

Fellow Citizens:

An address of Henry Clay to the public has been lately disseminated, in which he endeavors to prove that no propnsition was made by him or his friends to General Jackson, previous to the late Presidential election, and that there was no understanding between him and Mr. Adams.

Almost every member of the Legislature received a copy of this production *franked by Mr. Clay himself*. As soon as they had time to read it, Mr. Beatty of the Senate, offered, in Committee of the Whole, a number of resolutions as a substitute for others reported by the Committee on Internal Improvements, and then under consideration, which embraced not only the subject of the original resolutions, but also an eulogy on the present administration and a censure upon its opponents. These resolutions, it was well understood, were drawn by Mr. Ben. Hardin. The fifth reads as follows:

"This Legislature views, with deep concern, and feelings of just indignation, the efforts that are now making throughout the United States, to blast the reputatinn of the distinguished members of Congress from this State, who voted for John Q. Adams to be President of the United States. They have no hesitation in saying, that it is their confirmed opinion, from great deliberation and a full examination of all the facts and evidence adduced, that the charges of bargain, sale and corruption in the election of John Q. Adams, are utterly false and malicious; that they are brought forward and endeavored to be sustained for party purposes, and to elevate Gen. Jackson to the office of President of the United States."

The friends of Gen. Jackson objected to this resolution, because it embraced subjects not within the scope of the legitimate powers of the Legislature. The Legislature represents the people, and, under certain restrictions, is the sovereign power of the State. When Kentucky speaks as a government, she speaks through her Legislature. All the acts of that body which come within the scope of its legitimate powers, bind the people. If the Senate or House of Representatives attempt an act which does not bind their constituents, that act is not within the limit of their powers, and is either wholly nugatory or an usurpation. Test this resolution by that principle. Does the opinion of the Legislature as to the motives if those members of Congress who voted for John Quincy Adams, bind the people? Or, when the Legislature declare that the friends of General Jackson are slanderers, actuated by party purposes, are the people bound by the declaration? Have they delegated their right to think and form opinions relative to public or private men, to their Senators and Representatives of the General Assembly? Are they bound to take the opinions of these subordinate servants as conclusive of the character and acts of the general administration, and vote for him as President or member of Congress whom they may designate in their resolutions? Such assertions would be repelled with indignation by every freeman of Kentucky.

If, therefore, the Senate assumed to speak in the name of the people, they were guilty of gross usurpation. The people have not yet given up their right to think for themselves, and resolve in their own minds, upon the character and pretension of men in office, and candidates for promotion, without receiving the mandate of the honorable Senate or General Assembly in the town of Frankfort. But if the Senator who introduced this resolution and those who voted for it, were acting for themselves, they mistook the time and place, as well as the proper style of their acts. They were sitting in a house provided by the people, were paid with the people's money, and assumed to resolve in the name of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Had they been honest, would they not have first adjourned, found their own house, lived on their own money, met in open and avowed Caucus, and resolved in the name of "this Assembly"? The people might then have laughed them to scorn; but they could not have complained, as they do now, that these men used their house, wasted their time, and squandered their money, in discussing, for days and weeks, resolutions, which, if ushered forth in the name of the people, are a gross usurpation, as ridiculous as it is extravagant.

These resolutions are not in principle like those of 1824, requesting our members in Congress to vote for General Jackson. A sovereign act was then about to be performed; the vote of this great State was about to be given for President. The Legislature, the only representative of that sovereignty, requested the vote to be given for General Jackson, assuring the instruments who were to speak Kentucky's voice, that such was the will of the people. That ought to have been received as a mandate, and implicitly obeyed. But it was disregarded; and now what do we see? The same men, one of whom said after the election that we were sold as a Virginian transfers his plantation and negroes, bow in humble submission to their new master, turn round and tell the people *all's well*, and endeavor even to usurp their power of thought!

The friends of the right of instruction and of Jackson, warmly protested against the right of the Senate to give opinions for the people; but finding the majority determined to march forward, they insisted, that an opinion ought not to be expressed without the adoption of efficient means to test its correctness. The resolution spoke of "a full examination of all the facts and evidence adduced," and if they would go

E 380
U 57
2d set

on, it was their duty to procure and examine all the evidence within their reach. On the next morning, General *Allen* accordingly offered the following resolution:

"Whereas, in a resolution now before the Committee of the Whole House to which was referred the report and resolutions of the Committee on Internal Improvements, the following subjects are brought before the committee, upon which they are required to decide, to wit: 'This Legislature view with deep concern and feelings of just indignation, the efforts which are now making throughout the United States, to blast the reputation of the distinguished members of Congress from this State who voted for John Q. Adams to be President of the United States. They have no hesitation in saying, that it is their confirmed opinion, from great deliberation and a full examination of all the facts and evidence adduced, that the charges of bargain, sale, and corruption, in the election of John Q. Adams, are utterly false and malicious: that they are brought forward and endeavored to be sustained for party purposes, and to elevate Gen. Jackson to the office of President of the United States." Therefore, to enable the Committee to examine into and investigate the transactions embraced in the foregoing resolution, *Resolved*, That said Committee be authorized and instructed to send for persons and papers."

The Adams men affected to consider this proposition as a mere joke, and laid it on the table. Though their resolution, in its very terms, spoke of the examination of evidence adduced, nothing was further from their thoughts than to adduce any evidence at all. But nothing was more plain, than that if they had a right to pass their resolution, they had a right to bring before them all the evidence which might conduce to a correct opinion. It became current that they intended to act without evidence, because they dared not introduce it, and they became alarmed. Not knowing what to do, dreading to go forward and afraid to go back, finally, Mr. Beatty presented his resolution in the Senate; Mr Lockett, one of their own party, called up General Allen's, which they so amended as to bring the evidence before the bar of the Senate, and generally voted for its adoption. The time allowed to procure witnesses from all parts of the State, was but six days.

The day set for the inquiry arrived, and scarcely a man of those who had been summoned out of Frankfort, made his appearance. The friends of General Jackson, still anxious to get rid of the whole subject, the resolution of Mr. Beatty as well as the examination of witnesses, proposed to postpone the whole matter to a day beyond the session. The Adams men, relying, we presume, upon the absence of witnesses, appeared now to have become bold, and determined to go immediately into the inquiry. But they never contemplated any thing like a full and complete investigation. They had gone into it because they dared not refuse, and relying on their majority, they intended to exclude whatever they thought it dangerous to admit, and under some pretext, put a stop to it, if its progress was likely to prove fatal to their party views. You will see full evidence of all this in the incidents which occurred during the investigation.

The examination of witnesses commenced, and the friends of truth and the people will find much cause to rejoice that the violation of principle and right in the Senate, has led to disclosures which have covered the perpetrators with confusion, and will hasten the downfal of the reign of intrigue and corruption.

In relation to Mr. Francis Johnson, it was proved, that before the Presidential election he had spoken against Mr. Adams; that after Mr. Clay was excluded from the House he received a parcel of letters from home, which instructed him to "stick to Old Hickory—give us a western President whatever you do;" that after voting for Mr. Adams in defiance of all this, as well as the instructions of the Legislature, he came home and gave as his reason, that it was "*to get Mr. Clay made Secretary of State.*" See the evidence of Mr. Hitt and James M'Millan, Esq.

In relation to General Metcalfe, it was proved, that early in January, 1825, in speaking of the election and the Kentucky delegation, he said, "*I know little more than when I came here—we stand uncommitted—we must know something about how the cabinet is to be filled.*" After the election, when told by Col. Johnson, that voting for Mr. Adams would be an up-hill business in Kentucky, he replied, "*I fear we have done too much for our friend.*" To remove all doubt who this friend was, he stated after his return home, that "*we could not possibly get Mr. Clay in the cabinet, without voting for and electing Mr. Adams.*" See the evidence of Mr. Hitt, J. T. Johnson, Esq. and the statement of Mr. John Desha.

In relation to Mr. David Trimble, it is proved, that in 1824, he abused John Q. Adams as *a worse politician than his father, an apostate federalist, an enemy of the west, who offered at Ghent to barter away the navigation of the Mississippi to the British for a mess of codfish*, and said "*if he ever voted for him he would agree to be called a federalist as long as he lived.*" Yet in the face of his own declared opinions, as well as the will of the people and the request of the Legislature, did he vote for this man, whom he had so violently denounced. What was his apology? He gave it himself—"WE DISTINCTLY ASCERTAINED, *that Mr. Adams would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State, and that in all probability General Jackson would not.*" See the evidence of Mr. John Mason, jr. the statements of M. Harrison, Esq. and eleven citizens of Fleming county, the letter of Jesse Summers, Esq. and the affidavit of Messrs. Henry Halbert and Jesse Hamrick.

Is it possible that a bargain could be more clearly proved, without the production of a writing signed and sealed by the contracting parties? Here was an act done by one party in *consideration* of an act to be done by another. A part of the Kentucky delegation avowedly stood uncommitted for the purpose of *ascertaining how the cabinet was to be filled;* they did ascertain that Mr. Adams would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State; *that* was the *consideration* given for their votes, and they came home and said so. Mr. Adams *did pay the consideration* by making Mr. Clay Secretary of State, and the contract was thus fulfilled by both of the high contracting parties! We are sure that no honest jury would require stronger evidence to prove a *contract.*

The friends of General Jackson offered to prove before the Senate, the confessions of D. White, Esq. one of the members of Congress implicated in voting for Mr. Adams. It would have been an insult to Mr. White, as well as a violation of the constitution, to introduce him to purge himself on oath, or to testify against himself; yet did the Adams majority, under pretence that Mr. White should be himself made a witness, vote to exclude all evidence of his confessions, whether made before or since the Presidential election! This step was without right or precedent; it was an act of *arbitrary power* for the purpose of shutting out *unwelcome truths*. Had Mr. White's confessions been admitted, we are authorized to say, it would have been proved, that while at Washington, and ever since his return, he has uniformly said that he voted for Mr. Clay, and not for Mr. Adams, that Mr. Adams would never have been President, had not Mr. Clay been Secretary of State; that although he knew of no direct and positive bargain, a part of the Kentucky delegation held a caucus, in which, after consulting Mr. Clay himself, they determined to support Mr. Adams, being perfectly satisfied that he would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State; and that this, and nothing else, was his motive in voting for Mr Adams. It was these damning facts, which the majority did not wish to hear, and therefore excluded all evidence of Mr. White's declarations!

This inquiry, connected with facts already before the public, has placed Mr. Clay in a most awkward attitude. He has publicly denied, that there was ever any serious difference between him and Mr. Adams relative to the negotiations at Ghent, and his friend, Mr. Wickliffe, ventured to assert the same thing in the most positive terms on the floor of the Senate.

A series of letters was written and published in the Argus in 1822 and 1823, reviewing Mr. Adams' Book on the Ghent negotiation, in which he was charged with violating instructions, with deadly hostility to the Western country, with injustice to Mr. Clay, with attempting to sell the blood of the West for the privilege of fishing in British waters, with disingenuousness, falsehood, and ignorance! It was proved, that after the publication of these letters, Mr. Clay promoted their republication, in pamphlet form, and actually paid $100 of his own money for that purpose! See the evidence of Messrs. Tanner and Kendall. Capt. Daveiss asserted in debate, and declared the proof was at hand, that Mr. Clay had himself received in manuscript and sent to Ohio for publication, articles containing the same serious charges against Mr. Adams, and the friends of Mr. Clay neither denied it nor called for the proof. If the charges made against Mr. Adams were *untrue*, Mr. Clay stands convicted as his *slanderer* and *libeller*; if they were true, then he has allied himself with a man whom he *knew* to be capable of *selling the blood of the West*. In either alternative, what must the world think of Mr. Clay?

The attitude in which Mr. Clay has placed himself and his friends, was fully exposed in the Senate. Mr. Pope offered an amendment to the white-washing resolution, declaring all these charges against Mr. Adams published in 1822-3, to be 'utterly false.' The friends of Mr. Clay were placed in a sad dilemma. If they voted for this amendment, with the evidence before them that Mr. Clay had himself circulated these charges, and paid for their circulation, they would vote that he was a slanderer and a libeller; if they voted against it, they would vote that Adams was an enemy of the West, ready to sell its blood! In this predicament, they divided; some voted that Clay was a libeller, and others that Adams was a knave; but the amendment was rejected by the casting vote of the Lt. Governor. This shows that the party care nothing for Mr Adams; they will vote him a knave when he stands alone, but an honest man, when connected with Mr. Clay! His making Mr. Clay Secretary of State, is the *consideration* of their support, as it was of the votes of Mr. Clay and his friends in Congress.

Notwithstanding the tremendous charges which Mr. Clay had circulated against Mr. Adams, he endeavors to prove that he had made up his mind to vote for him as early as the fall of 1824, and never wavered in his determination. It is proved by the statement of Maj. Carneal, that at the very time Mr. Clay was saying to J. J. Crittenden and others, that he should vote for Mr. Adams, he told him that he was *wholly uncommitted*. To Major Carneal, to another distinguished member of the Legislature, and to C. A. Wickliffe, Esq. he did, about the same time, convey the impression, that there was no obstacle to his voting for General Jackson, and that he had not made up his mind! To Major T. P. Moore he used the same language after his arrival at Washington City.

What shall we think of this? Had he not made up his mind to vote for Mr. Adams: Then he stated falsehoods to Mr. Crittenden, and others. Had he made up his mind, as he now asserts: Then he was playing the hypocrite with the friends of Gen. Jackson in our Legislature, and a portion of our members of Congress. Which position will he take? He cannot escape from both.

It is easier to perceive Mr. Clay's motives than to vindicate his cause. While he was telling one set of individuals that he should vote for Mr. Adams, he was assuring the friends of Gen. Jackson in the Legislature that he was uncommitted and felt no repugnance to voting for their favorite, with the object of *preventing the passage of resolutions of instruction, keeping himself free to make the best bargain he could and escape from future embarrassment*. With the same view, he urged the members of Congress to remain uncommitted, and conveyed the impression that he stood in that attitude himself. His language was, *do not instruct me; I and my friends in Congress remain uncommitted; I hope you have confidence in me that I will do my duty; there is no obstacle to my voting for Gen. Jackson.* Now, why all this fear of instructions and committals? Mr. Clay told Maj. Carneal, "*I stand uncommitted*;" he advised Messrs. Wickliffe and Moore to remain *uncommitted*; Gen. Metcalfe told Mr. Hitt, "*we stand uncommitted.*" Now, what was the object of all this? General Metcalfe has told us—"*we must know something about how the cabinet is to be filled.*" The object of Mr. Clay and his friends is here distinctly avowed. Well, did they find out *how the cabinet was to be filled?* Let Mr. Trimble answer—"WE DISTRICT [illegible]

ascertained *that Mr. Adams would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State.*" We thus have, in the confessions of Mr. Clay's own friends, a full explanation of his movements; he wished to avoid instructions and prevent committals until he could "*know how the cabinet was to be filled;*" but as soon as it was "*distinctly ascertained*" that Mr. Adams would make him Secretary of State, and arrangements were made to transfer to him the votes of the west for that consideration, then, and not till then, did Mr. Clay come out openly for Mr. Adams.

Whether Mr. Clay made up his mind to vote for Mr. Adams as early as the fall of 1824 or not, is wholly immaterial. If he had, he was resolved not to let Mr. Adams know it, until he "knew something about how the cabinet was to be filled." In plain language, *he was determined to get the best price he could; and for his vote and influence he did get the office of Secretary of State.* His declarations to Maj. Carneal and others, and his letter to General Jackson in the fall of 1824, induce the belief, that he would just as soon have voted for General Jackson, could he have *secured his price.*

It is proved by the evidence of Mr. Kendall and the statement of J. Dudley, Esq. that in January 1825, several weeks before the Presidential election, F. P. Blair, Esq. an intimate and confidential friend of Mr. Clay, told them that Mr. Clay would be Secretary of State, if Mr. Adams was made President, and requested them to write to the representative from this district to vote for Mr. Adams, for the purpose of securing that office to Mr. Clay. He predicated his assurance to Mr. Dudley upon letters from Washington City. During the late inquiry, Mr. Blair was called before the Senate for the purpose of proving from whom he got this information. He refused to be sworn, on the ground, among other things, that he received it in "private communications and a confidential correspondence" which the Senate had no right to extort from him. It was believed, that the correspondence alluded to, was with Mr. Clay himself, and now the Senate seemed to be approaching to direct and positive proof. This the Adams men were as little desirous to see as they were to hear the confessions of Mr. White. They immediately took the ground, that they would force nobody to swear, declaring in positive terms, that they wanted to hear none but willing witnesses. Thus, after going into the inquiry because they dared not refuse it, so alarmed were they lest the *whole truth* should come out, that they openly countenanced and applauded a contempt of their authority, and endeavored to induce every witness to refuse his testimony, lest he should be denounced as a *mere volunteer!* Yet, these are the men who undertake to denounce the friends of Jackson as slanderers, because we assert that which they know is already proved, and would have been proved in a manner to silence even *knavery itself*, had they maintained the dignity of the Senate, and extorted the testimony which was already before them.

The country will judge what chance the friends of Jackson had to bring out the proof before a tribunal so partial in its decisions and so wanting in respect for itself. In some instances, testimony which was obviously legal and proper, was arbitrarily excluded, and in others the majority not only encouraged contempts of the Senate, but to make themselves completely ridiculous, in one case entered them upon their Journals. Posterity will with wonder find on their records the protest of Mr. Blair, a perpetual witness that they were conscious of the error of their proceedings, or were a partial tribunal, submitting, with the utmost tameness, to contempt and indignity, rather than bring out important evidence which they knew to exist. That such was their real character, all their proceedings evince. Perceiving that the proof of a bargain was coming in by piece-meal as the evidence arrived, they hastened the inquiry to a close *before witnesses summoned by themselves had time to arrive*, and then attempted to turn the whole into ridicule. Mr. Ben Hardin, instead of acting the part of a grave Senator, engaged in important public concerns, converted the Senate Chamber into a Theatre, and played the buffoon with great applause, by attempting to imitate and ridicule each witness who either testified or refused to testify, against Messrs. Adams and Clay. The evidence is now before the world, and the people will decide the great cause, regardless of his raillery.

Important as the evidence is which this inquiry has elicited, it has pointed to that which is still more important. Although Mr. Blair refused to be sworn, it was distinctly ascertained, from his apologies and other circumstances, that he procured the information which he communicated to Messrs. Kendall and Dudley, in confidential letters from Mr. Clay himself. Indeed, we are informed through a channel on which we confidently rely, that Mr. Clay's friends in Frankfort now have a copy of such a letter. This may account for their readiness in excusing Mr. Blair. They may have preferred to submit to any contempt of their authority, and even enter it on record, rather than see this damning document. But how will they excuse themselves to their constituents or their consciences for adopting a resolution, when they had the most positive evidence of its falsehood in their possession? How could they say *Ay*, upon a resolution declaring the charges of bargain to be "utterly false, and circulated for party purposes," when they knew that the original document proving them true, was in sight of the capitol?

Their effrontery is equal to all emergencies. They now say that Mr. Blair refused to swear because he had nothing to tell! They charge him with *acting a part*, and pretending to have important secrets which he has not. How weak an attempt to deceive! Cannot they put this matter to the test? Could they not have forced Mr. Blair to tell all he knew? Cannot they now get Mr. Clay to release him from all confidence and call on him to come out with "the truth the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?" This is what the people will demand of Mr. Clay. If he make this call, and Mr. Blair do not disclose any thing of importance, then may they, with some propriety, hold him up to the scorn and derision of the country. For ourselves, we do not doubt that full proof of a direct bargain is in the hands of Mr. Blair.

How changed is Henry Clay from what he once was! Once, he was the open and frank servant of the people; ready to do their will, as

matter by what means it came to his knowledge. Since his return from Europe, he has been a changed man. He sought to destroy Mr. Adams by secretly stimulating attacks upon him while he bore towards him an exterior of civility, if not of friendship. He taught us and the people of the west to hate Mr. Adams as our greatest enemy; yet to secure an office to himself, he rushes into his bosom. The voice of the people which it was once his pride to obey, he has attempted to stifle, and then treated it with contempt. He sought to prevent an expression of the voice of Kentucky through her legislature, lest it should embarrass him in his selfish designs. After that body had spoken with a voice almost unanimous, he sought to defeat the public will thus expressed, by procuring private letters to be written to members of Congress advising them to disregard it. If he had desired to obey the public will, why did he not get his friends to call meetings of the people and take their voice? This would have defeated his object. He was determined to pursue his own will, regardless of that of the people, for the purpose of placing himself in the line of 'safe precedents,' and then, by intrigue and management, power and patronage, bend the public will to his own selfish purposes.

We thought this Address due to the people of Kentucky on this interesting occasion. A full reply to Mr. Clay's Address is shortly expected from Washington, the circulation of which we shall promote to the extent of our power. The people need but a true knowledge of facts, to bring to a speedy close, the reign of bargain, intrigue and falsehood.

By order of the Central Jackson Committee of Kentucky.

SAMUEL SOUTH, *Chairman.*

Lewis Sanders, Jr. *Secretary.*

KENTUCKY LEGISLATURE.

From the Western Kentucky Argus.

THE INVESTIGATION.

THURSDAY, JAN. 31.

The Senate took up the resolutions on the subject of Internal Improvements, together with the amendment offered by Mr. Beatty declaring the distinguished members of Congress from this State who had voted for Mr. Adams, innocent of bargain, &c. and that all the charges to that effect, made against them, were false and malicious. After some desultory discussion, which we did not hear, Mr. *Maupin* called for the previous question, which, it was supposed, would have the effect of ridding the Senate of the whole subject except the original resolutions relative to Internal Improvements. This motion was seconded by Mr. M'Connell.

Mr. *Beatty* opposed the previous question, which was advocated by Mr. *M'Connell.*

Mr. *Daveiss* moved a recess for an hour and a half, that the members might consult together and come to some understanding, &c. which motion prevailed.

After the recess, Mr. *Wickliffe* opposed the previous question, and maintained that the proposition for an investigation was an independent one not embraced by it, and that its success would not rid the Senate of the inquiry. He also contended that the hearing of testimony was the order of the day, and not the consideration of these resolutions.

Mr. *Pope* concurred in the suggestion that the Senate were wrong in taking up the resolutions, and that the proper business of the day was the hearing of evidence.

Mr. *Maupin* withdrew the call for the previous question.

Mr. *Pope* then moved that all the resolutions before the Senate embracing the subject of the proposed investigation, be laid on the table until the last day of July next, and said he would then concur in striking from the Journals the resolution providing for an investigation.

Mr. *M'Connell* stated that he was now fo going into it.

Mr. *Wickliffe* moved to lay down the resolutions for the purpose of going into the investigation. This motion prevailed.

The resolution ordering an investigation was then taken up, and the following evidence offered:

James M'Millan, of the House of Representatives, stated in reply to interrogatories, that Mr. Francis Johnson was at Tompkinsville, in Monroe county, after his return home subsequent to the Presidential election, where he was asked how he came to vote for Mr. Adams? Mr. Johnson answered, that he voted for Mr. Adams to get Mr. Clay made Secretary of State. He made this declaration repeatedly in conversation, and witness believed in a public speech. He said, that Mr. Adams for President and Mr. Clay his Secretary would conduce more to the interests of the west than General Jackson President, with we know not whom for his Secretary, and that Mr. Clay might perhaps succeed him. He did not hear Mr. Johnson say, that Mr. Adams made any promises to appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State if he would support him. Previous to his going on to Congress, Mr. Johnson spoke against Mr. Adams and in favor of Mr. Clay; but witness never heard him say for whom he intended to vote, if Mr. Clay was excluded from Congress, nor did he, previous to that time, ever hear him say a word against General Jackson. Witness was a Jackson man.

Henry Grider, of the House of Representatives, said, Mr. F. Johnson in all conversations and speeches in his presence had denied all corruption, bargain and sale in the Presidential election, and said he neither knew nor believed any such thing. He had disclaimed all knowledge that he would appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State, or who was to compose his cabinet. He said he supported Mr. Adams, because he believed him devoted to Internal Improvements and Domestic Manufactures, and that his doctrines and policy were such as would suit the west. He said that General Jackson would not suit us, because he was a southern man, and would pursue a southern policy. Mr. Johnson said these things after he was charged with bargain, sale and corruption; but witness supposed the papers containing those charges got to Kentucky as soon as Mr. Johnson did after the election. He lives in the same town with Mr. Johnson, and has conversed with him frequently from the time he came home, and he has ne-

family made the same declaration. Witness never heard him say he preferred Gen. Jackson. Witness said he was an administration man, or a friend of Internal Improvements and Domestic Manufactures.

Witness said he knew not why he was called, unless it was from a remark he made in Frankfort, that they need not send to Bowling-green for testimony, for he knew as much about it as any body there, meaning that there was nobody there who knew any thing about it. It was in the presence of Mr. B. Johnson and Mr. Kendall. [The latter recollects the remark, but did not presume him to be summoned.]

William Tanner was called and sworn. A pamphlet was shown to him, entitled "Letters to John Quincy Adams, relative to the Fisheries and the Mississippi, first published in the Argus of Western America, revised and enlarged, by Amos Kendall," and he was asked whether he printed it. He replied that he did. He was asked, whether Mr. Clay paid any part of the expense. He replied that he did pay $100; that he, Tanner, undertook to print the pamphlet by subscription; that Mr. Kendall told him Mr. Clay had proposed to him to print it and offered to pay a part of the expense; that he had taken a letter from Mr. Kendall to Mr. Clay; that Mr. Clay conversed with him as to the expense of printing the pamphlet, and the subscription for it; that he told him to go to Mr. Thomas Smith, who would hand him $75, and that if he should not be remunerated by the subscriptions, to call on him and he would pay him the balance of the expense; that he called on Mr. Smith, who paid him the money; that the subscriptions falling short, he again called on Mr. Clay, who sent him to Mr. Smith for $23 more. The pamphlet was printed in the latter part of 1823.

Amos Kendall stated in reply to interrogatories, that after the charges against Mr. Adams relative to the negotiation at Ghent had come before the public, he wrote and published an article in the Argus upon that subject, containing a view of it which Mr. Clay deemed erroneous. Mr. Adams seized upon the article, copied it into his book on the Fisheries and the Mississippi, and made a commentary upon it in which he insinuated that it came from Mr. Clay. The latter afterwards called upon witness, entered into a narrative of the transactions at Ghent, including an explanation of the principles involved, and satisfied witness that the view he had taken was erroneous. Witness then took up Mr. Adams' Book upon the Fisheries, &c. and reviewed it in a series of Letters published in the Argus, addressed to John Quincy Adams. After most of the series had been published, Mr. Clay conversed with witness about publishing them in pamphlet, and offered to pay $50 of the expense. Witness declined publishing them, but told him, that if he or his friends thought proper to publish them elsewhere, he would revise and prepare them for the press. Learning from Mr. Tanner, that he had determined to print them, witness gave him a letter to Mr. Clay, soliciting him to pay Mr. Tanner what he had promised to witness. Witness did revise the Letters and they were published by Mr. Tanner.

Mr. *Pope* told witness to stand aside, and that he would again be called to another point, and witness retired to his seat.

It was insisted that the examination of the witness should be completed, before he was permitted to retire. Some remarks were made which seemed to reflect on witness as not having told all he was bound to tell, when he observed that he was ready to answer questions if there were any to be asked. Mr. John Green inquired whether he had told all he knew about bargain, sale and corruption, and if so, he had nothing further to ask. The witness returned no answer and sat down.

Mr. Pope again called the witness, and asked him what he had heard Mr. David White say as to his motives for voting for Mr. Adams?

Mr. Hardin objected to this question being answered. A discussion arose in which Messrs. Hardin, M'Connell and Wickliffe contended that the question ought not to be answered, and Messrs. Pope, Daviess and Allen maintained that it ought. The former insisted that Mr. White himself was a competent witness, and that he ought to be sent for; that his character was not under investigation, and that if he knew any thing in relation to a bargain between Adams and Clay, he ought to be brought in to state it himself, as he is not more than twelve miles off, instead of proving his declarations when not on oath; that they were willing the declarations of those members of Congress who were not here, and could not be got here, should be proved. On the other side it was maintained, that the conduct of Mr. White was brought under investigation as much as that of any other member of Congress from Kentucky who voted for Mr. Adams; that his declarations were good evidence against himself, and to that point only were they offered to be proved; that he could not consistently, with any rule of law or propriety be introduced to purge himself upon oath; that the principles assumed here would exclude the declarations of every member of Congress, who voted for Mr. Adams and put an end to the inquiry; that it could be considered as urged only for the purpose of excluding evidence which gentlemen knew would prove the truth of the charges made by the friends of Jackson, and Mr. Pope, in emphatic terms, told the Senate, that he viewed it as an effort of the majority to exclude the truth in an investigation which themselves had sought and urged, and so he would tell the people.

The vote was taken upon the question 'shall the question be answered?' and decided in the negative. The Senate then adjourned.

Friday, February 1.

Sickness prevented our attending the Senate on this day, and consequently we can only give the evidence as we have written it out from the notes of others.

Thomas D. Carneal, a Senator, at the request of Mr. Pope, stated, that he knew nothing of any bargain, sale or corruption in the Presidential election, nor did he believe in it, but he believed there was management in Congress, such as is common in all such bodies for the purpose of carrying a point. Had he been there, he would not have voted for Mr. Adams unless he had first agreed to appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State; for he considered it the duty of our

members so to manage as to secure the interests of their State.

He had a conversation with Mr. Clay at his room a few days before he started for WaahingtonCity, in the fall of 1824. Mr. Clay said, he did not like to be instructed by the Legislature as to his vote, should he not be returned to the House as one of the three highest which he thought doubtful, but wished to be left entirely free. Mr. Carneal told him, he had intended to introduce resolutions of instruction into the Senate himself requesting the Kentucky delegation to vote for General Jackson, but promised, on account of the objections of Mr. Clay, not to do it, although he said he must vote for them should they be introduced by others. Mr. Clay said, in case he were excluded from the House, he was wholly uncommitted as to his vote, and wished to be left free. This conversation took place while the Legislature was in session in the fall of 1824.

Oliver Keene stated, that in the fall of 1824, eight or ten days before Mr. Clay started for Washington City, he asked Mr. Clay in conversation, whether he had written to General Jackson to come to his house and go on to Washington with him? Mr. Clay said he had. Witness was a warm supporter of Mr. Clay, but prefers Jackson to Adams.

Francis McAlear stated, that on the morning Mr Clay started for Washington, in the fall of 1824, in the presence of several gentlemen, he heard Mr. Clay say he had written to General Jackson to come through Lexington and go on to Washington with him, but had received no answer, and had given him out. Witness was a warm advocate of Mr. Clay, until he voted for John Quincy Adams.

Mr. Shackleford said, he was present when Mr. David Trimble made a speech after his return from Congress in 1825, and heard him say that he voted against General Jackson and for Mr. Adams, because the policy of the former was not favorable to the interests of the western country, and the policy of the latter was. He also said, he thought the people would be pleased with Mr. Clay for Secretary of State. Witness is an Adams man.

John T. Johnson stated, that he was at Washington City in 1824, and at the time of the Presidential election in February 1825. After the election, he and his brother (Col. Johnson,) were in company with General Metcalfe, who told them he had a letter from Kentucky which stated, that the people would be dissatisfied with the result. His brother told the General, that this voting for Mr. Adams would be an uphill business in Kentucky. The General replied, I fear we have done too much for our friend.

He knew of no direct bargain, nor of any corruption, nor had he ever believed there was any. He had very little intercourse with the members of Congress who voted for Mr. Adams, it being well known that he intended to vote for General Jackson.

He was asked to state, whether he did not hear Mr. White, one of the members of Congress who voted for Mr. Adams, say, a few days after the election, that he considered when voting for Mr. Adams that he was voting for Mr. Clay?

This question was objected to and overruled, 14 to 19.

Witness was further asked, whether he did no hear Mr. White say, either on his way to Congress or at any time before the Presidential election, that he would vote for General Jackson in preference to Adams or Crawford?

This was also overruled, 14 to 19.

Witness was further asked, did or did you not hear Mr. White say, that if Mr. Adams were elected, Mr. Clay would be made Secretary of State?

This was also overruled, 13 to 19.

Mr. Clay was in his room a few days before the election, and said, he thought the Kentucky delegation might vote either way, and Kentucky would be satisfied.

In December, at a public dinner, he saw Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay sitting together, and observed that they were very social and friendly. From this circumstance he said to his brother, that he was persuaded Mr. Clay intended to vote for Mr. Adams. Mr. Clay told witness he had been instructed by a few of his constituents in a part of his District above Lexington, to do as he pleased. After Mr. Clay was appointed Secretary of State, he asked witness whether he ought to accept, and witness told him, he thought he ought.

Joseph Secrest, a member of the House of Representatives, stated, that he heard Mr. David Trimble say in a speech or speeches made in 1824, that John Q. Adams was a noted federalist; that he was inimical to the west and wanted to sell to the British the navigation of the Mississippi. After his return from Congress in 1825, he heard Mr. Trimble give as an apology for voting for Adams, that if Mr. Adams had not been elected, Mr. Clay would not have been Secretary of State, and that if General Jackson had been elected, Mr. Adams would have been Secretary. Witness did not like his apology, and did not wait to hear all he said about it. Trimble since explained to him, alleging that he said Mr. Adams was a *reputed* federalist, and not a noted federalist. Gen. Jackson is not witness' first choice for President, by several; but Adams is his last.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2.

Amos Kendall being again called, was asked, whether he was not informed, three or four weeks before the Presidential election, that Mr. Clay would be Secretary of State, if Mr. Adams were made President?

Mr. *Hardin* objected to the question being answered, unless it were first stated from whom the information came.

Witness said he was embarrassed, because to state from whom the information came, was to say he had the information; and on the supposition he had not the information, it could have come from nobody.

He was told to answer, and accordingly answered, that he had such information from Francis P. Blair, Esq. of Frankfort.

Mr. *John Green* asked, if it was the same F. P. Blair who was Clerk of the New Court?

Witness answered, that it was the same who, in the days of the New Court, was the Clerk of the Court of Appeals.

Mr. *Innes* asked, whether Mr. Blair ha

not been, for many years, the intimate and confidential friend of Mr. Clay?

This question, as well as the question and answer first above given, were objected to, and voted to be improper and inadmissible, by a vote of 10 to 20.

Witness said, he felt bound to state a circumstance which he could not help believing had some bearing upon the subject of this inquiry, upon which the Senate might draw their own inferences.

After Mr. Clay was excluded from the House, and previous to the Presidential election, he received a letter from Mr. Clay, communicating his intention to offer witness some situation at Washington, contingent, as he understood it, upon the result of the Presidential election. The expressions of the letter, so far as he could recollect, were, that he, Mr. Clay, had hoped to have it in his power to offer him, witness, a situation at Washington more agreeable to him than the one he occupied in Frankfort, but that there was then some doubt as to the result of affairs there. Witness thinks it was written and received in January, 1825. The letter contained no other subject, and witness, not perceiving any other object in it, took it merely as an indication of Mr. Clay's friendly designs in relation to himself.

After the Presidential election, and after Mr. Clay was made Secretary of State, witness received another letter from him, stating that he intended to offer him a situation at Washington City; but it was wholly indefinite as to the nature of the situation intended to be offered. Witness imagined Mr. Clay wanted him to write in support of Mr. Adams and himself, and to ascertain whether he was authorized from the letter and circumstances, to take up such an impression, he showed this letter to two of Mr. Clay's and his own friends, separately, and asked each of them to read it, and say what situation Mr. Clay intended. They read it, and each gave his opinion, that Mr. Clay desired to place witness in a situation to write in support of Mr. Adams and himself. Witness then wrote to him, communicating the impression he had taken up, stating that he had been for some years writing against Mr. Adams, and wished it to be understood, before any offer was made, that he could except no situation in which it would be expected of him to take up his pen in support of Mr. Adams; but that in relation to him, Mr. Clay, the feelings of witness were wholly different, and it would give him pleasure to vindicate him against the slanders which were afloat against him; for he then believed much that was said against him, to be slanders.

Witness heard nothing more from Mr. Clay, in relation to this subject, until he came out to Kentucky, he thinks, in the following June, calling upon Mr. Clay at his room at Weisiger's, one of the first remarks made to him by that gentleman was, that witness had totally misconceived his object; that he did not wish him to go to Washington for the purpose of engaging in politics, but to secure his services in the Department of State. He then offered witness a Clerkship with a salary of $1000, with the express injunction, that he should say nothing on the subject, and not leave Kentucky until [illegible] Witness recollects August. After a little conversation upon the expense of living at Washington, witness declined Mr. Clay's offer, stating that he had several children for whose support and education he must provide, and could not accept a place which would afford him but a bare subsistence. Mr. Clay said, there was none more valuable then within his gift, unless he were to make a vacancy; but that probably an opportunity might offer to give witness a place which would be acceptable to him. Witness told him then and informed him at other times, that he would accept such a place, always with the understanding that he should take no part in the politics of the day.

Some time after this, witness met Squire Turner, of Madison county, in the streets of Frankfort, who accosted him and said, I understand you are going to Washington city to write for Adams and Clay. Witness asked him where he got his information? Mr. Turner said, such was the talk up in his section of the country. Witness told him, it was not true. A few days after, he understood that George Robertson had said, at the Mercer Court, that they, the Old Court party, would not have witness to contend with much longer, saying or implying that he was bought up to go to Washington city. Knowing that no information of Mr. Clay's offer had gone from him on which this rumor could be predicated, witness supposed it must have come from Mr. Clay. He therefore wrote to Mr. Clay, informing him of the rumor then in circulation, and stating that he presumed it must have come from some person to whom he had communicated his intentions towards witness, and under those circumstances, witness must feel himself at liberty to detail the whole transaction whenever he thought proper, which he had done. Mr. Clay answered, that he was totally indifferent to what was said on the subject, as his motives in relation to him had been pure, and he had only wanted to engage his services in the Department of State.

After the elections in 1825, when the party to which witness belonged, were so effectually defeated, he informed Mr. Clay of the result, and that gentleman in his reply again offered him the same Clerkship. Witness declined accepting it, and informed Mr. Clay that so much injustice had been done him in that year's canvass that he was determined to have another campaign with the Old Court Party, and that no office he could offer, would take him from Kentucky until that was over.

Mr. Clay never made any other specific offer, although he still expressed a disposition to be friend witness in that way.

Mr. Hardin asked, if witness had the letters alluded to?

Witness said, he had burnt them all except the last.

Mr. H. asked, if he was in the habit of burning letters?

He said he was, such as he did not wish to fall into the hands of friends or foes.

Mr. H. said, you burn letters and then tell their contents?

Witness said, he had been reminded of his duty by the gentleman from Lincoln; that he should not have mentioned this affair if he had not now believed the first letter had some connexion with the application made to him by Mr. Hunt before the Presidential elections in rela-

tion to which the Senate might draw their own inferences.

Mr. H. asked, whether witness had not toasted Mr. Clay since the Presidential election.

Witness answered, it was very likely, although he did not recollect it; for his feelings were friendly towards Mr. Clay for some time after that event.

Mr. H. asked, whether witness had not applied to Mr. Clay, before his first letter, to get him an office?

Witness answered, never, although he had afterwards frequently expressed his readiness to accept one, if it were such as he could accept.

Mr. H. asked, if Mr. Clay's taking the printing of the acts of Congress from witness had not made him hostile to him.

Witness said, it was impossible for him to tell how far his feelings had been influenced by that act.

Mr. H. asked, if it had made witness more friendly to Mr. Clay?

Witness presumed not, although he was very glad Mr. Clay had done it.

Mr. Pope asked, what made witness glad that Mr. Clay took the printing from him?

Witness replied, that he came to Kentucky early in the year 1814, while Mr. Clay was in Europe; that it so happened, that Mrs. Clay employed him to live in her family one year and teach her children; that he remained there about a year, and then settled in Georgetown; that shortly afterwards, he went to Lexington on business and was taken sick in a boarding house; that Mrs. Clay, hearing of it, sent her carriage for him, and as soon as he could be removed, had him carried to her house, where she nursed him with the utmost kindness until he was able to return to Georgetown; that Mr. Clay had not yet come home and witness had never seen him; that this kindness of Mrs. Clay laid him under a weight of obligation to her which he always felt and acknowledged; that when Mr. Clay came home, he received a very cordial letter from him, thanking him for his service in his family, &c. that an acquaintance was formed shortly after, which was kept up with the most friendly feelings until since the late presidential election; that he had been stimulated in his exertions to promote Mr. Clay's views by his obligations to Mrs. Clay; that to Mr. Clay himself he owes no obligations and never did; that he had labored greatly and spent much of his time and some of his money in efforts to advance Mr. Clay, without asking for recompense or remuneration, until the advances made by Mr. Clay himself; that in taking the printing from witness, Mr. Clay on his part exhibited a personal hostility towards him, which relieved him from the restraint his feelings were under, and left him to take that course which he thought duty pointed out, perfectly unrestrained.

F. P Blair was then called. He refused to be sworn, and offered the following protest in writing:

I object to be sworn to give evidence in this inquiry. I hold that the 5th resolution of the Senate, declaring certain charges "*to be utterly false and malicious, and made throughout the United States to blast the reputations of the distinguished members of Congress from this State who voted for John Quincy Adams,*" upon which this investigation is founded, does not furnish a subject constitutionally cognizable by this Senate, either as a branch of the Legislature or as a judicial tribunal. But while I deny the *right*, I submit the *power* of the Senate, and will abide its ultimate decision

I also object, because the information I have, touching this inquiry, was obtained in the course of friendly communications and a private correspondence, which I deem confidential—such at least as was never designed for publication.

I assure the Senate, that I am not actuated to withhold my testimony by any consideration of the effect it might have on the reputations of the persons alluded to in the resolution, or on those inculpated as having made false charges against them. I oppose myself to a precedent which goes to violate confidential correspondence, and to render unsafe all friendly, social, and intimate intercourse among men. This obstacle it is not in the power of the Senate to remove, and I trust it will not exert its power to punish that good faith which would preserve a principle that should be held inviolable, unless where *the laws of the country demanded the sacrifice.*

Some conversation took place among the members, when *Mr. Hardin* offered to the Senate a paper declaring that the Senate would hear whatever evidence might be offered, but would use no compulsory means to extort it.

Mr. Daviess called on the majority to take the necessary steps to bring out the evidence. The friends of Mr. Adams have the majority in the Senate; they enter into an investigation to ascertain the truth; the minority offer a witness to prove a most important fact, he refuses to swear, and the majority pat him on the back and say, yes, my good fellow, keep it back, and we will protect you in it. Is this the way gentlemen intend to arrive at the truth and procure the means of forming a correct opinion? Is it by encouraging the witnesses not to swear and refusing to compel them, when they know, from the very objections offered, that the testimony is of the utmost importance? It was turning the whole subject into mockery, and would make the Senate the laughing stock of the world. The majority have refused to hear the declarations of one of the members of Congress who voted for Mr Adams be proved, and they now say to this witness, for God's sake, keep back what you know. Does not this look as if they were afraid of the truth? He called on the majority, and especially the gentleman from Fayette, who had yesterday said if they brought a witness there who refused to swear, he would take the means to compel him, now to adopt the measures which are necessary to bring the truth out of this witness.

Mr John Green observed, that he had expected a blow-out when he saw Mr. Blair introduced. He remembered a time when a body, called by the gentleman from Fayette, the Fungus Court, sat in this very house, and by their officers broke open the house of poor old Sneed, and seized his papers, and perhaps took him into custody. The witness, he believed, was Clerk of that Court; but he was glad to see him now on the side of the constitution. He did not enter into this thing for the purpose of hearing any other than *willing* witnesses. It was to give an opportunity for those who had been

trumpeting to the world the charges of bargain, sale, and corruption, to come in and show on what ground those charges had been founded. He was glad there was some faith left in the world, and maintained that the Senate had no right to extort from the witness communications made to him in confidence. For himself, he had had no conversation with Mr. Blair; but he presumed he must have spoken of letters from Mr. Clay or made communications of some kind to some body, or he would not have been called here as a witness, and surely he might disclose to the Senate whatever he had said relative to his confidential correspondence to any other person, &c.

Mr. Blair begged leave to explain. He said, in substance, in reply to Mr. Green's remarks, that Mr. Kendall's letters to Mr. Clay had pointed out him to the public as one who knew something in relation to the subject now before the Senate. These letters referred to a conversation which he had with Mr. Kendall in January 1825, in which he stated that Mr. Clay would be Secretary, if Mr. Adams were made President. Mr. Kendall supposed that the information was received in letters from Mr. Clay to Mr. Crittenden or myself, and as Mr. Crittenden had declared he received no such letters, it had pointed inquiry directly to him. Mr. Blair said, that Mr. Kendall had made his publications without consultation or authority from him, and that his inferences were not founded on any information, or warranted by any communication he had made to him, other than that before mentioned. He had not communicated to any one the grounds on which he had made his statement to Mr. Kendall, nor had he shown the letters to which the gentleman alluded to any person to whom they were not addressed.

A few remarks were made by other members; but extreme ill health compelled us to leave the Senate before the matter was decided, and not being in an attitude to take notes, we may not have reported what passed while we were there, with entire accuracy.

The question was finally put—shall Mr. Blair be sworn? and decided in the affirmative.

Mr. Blair then refused to be sworn peremptorily, and said he would sooner go to jail.

Finally, on motion of Mr. Pope, he was discharged.

Micajah Harrison was then called, and he also refused to be sworn, on the ground that what he knew was communicated in confidence.

It was moved to commit him until he would submit to give evidence before the Senate, which was decided in the negative, only six voting for it. He was then discharged.

John Mason, jr. was then called, and stated as follows:

John Mason of Montgomery states that before David Trimble went to Congress in 1824, say Sept. Court 1824, he was contending with witness, that Mr. Rowan ought not to be elected Senator to Congress, because he was an apostate federalist, and that he would be surprised if witness voted for him. Witness said, that the Presidential election was coming on, and from the number of candidates he expected that the election would come before Congress, and said to Trimble, suppose that you vote for Mr. Adams, who is also an apostate federalist. Trimble replied, he knew Adams to be an apostate federalist, and that if he ever voted for him, witness might call him a federalist as long as he lived. He also said, that Adams had agreed to give up the navigation of the Mississippi river for whales and mackerel, and that he, Adams, had always been an enemy to the West. When witness heard that Trimble had voted for Adams, he was surprised; and soon after his return, he had a conversation with him about his vote, in which he gave as his reasons, that we ascertained if Mr. Adams was made President, Mr. Clay would be made Secretary of State, and that if General Jackson was made President, Mr. Clay would not be made Secretary, and that it would be better for us to have Adams with Mr. Clay Secretary, than General Jackson without him. He also said at that time, or in some conversation after that General Jackson was opposed to the tariff on hemp, bagging, &c. and therefore opposed to the Kentucky interest, and he also gave as a reason, that Gen. Jackson had disgraced the Kentuckians at New Orleans in his report. He thinks he heard Maj. Trimble express some of the same opinions in his public speeches. Witness is a Jackson man, and as warm on any side he espouses as he thinks is right and justifiable; that he has had divers conversations and arguments with Maj. Trimble, and what he said as to the Tariff and the other objections, except the one in which he said that they had ascertained or discovered that if Adams were elected, Clay would be made Secretary, and if General Jackson were elected, that he would not be Secretary, were made in those after conversations.

Monday, February 4.

Some discussion took place upon a motion to take up the resolution from the Committee on Internal Improvements, with the amendments offered by Mr. *Beatty* in favor of the Administration, which was objected to on the ground that further evidence was expected in relation to the subject of the fifth resolution. The resolutions were, however, taken up; but the hour of twelve o'clock having arrived, the Speaker called for the orders of the day. A motion was made to dispense with the orders for the purpose of going on with the resolutions; but it was negatived, although a majority voted for it, the rule of the Senate requiring two thirds to dispense with the orders.

Tuesday, February 5.

Mr. *Wickliffe* offered a resolution rescinding the rule of the Senate requiring two thirds to concur in dispensing with the orders of the day. This motion was opposed by Messrs. *Davies*, *Pope* and *Dudley*, on the ground that it was intended to operate on the special case before the Senate, and that all such legislation is improper.

The hour of 12 o'clock having arrived, the Speaker called up the orders of the day. The resolutions in relation to Internal Improvements, and the Administration, were first in the orders, and were consequently taken up.

Mr. *Daviess* moved to admit and examine certain witnesses now in attendance. Some discussion took place on this subject, in which it was insisted, that the inquiry ought to be brought to an end, because the session is approaching to its close and it is proper that the

Legislature should express its opinion upon the subjects involved, before its adjournment. It was generally acceded, that the examination of witnesses should close on this day, unless testimony should be introduced on the Administration side, when rebutting evidence might be introduced.

John S. Hitt, of Bourbon, stated, that in 1825, on the 4th or 5th of January, he went into Washington City in the evening, and was in company with Gen. Metcalf, and asked him for information relative to the Presidential election? He said he knew little more than when he first arrived, or than witness; that the friends of Jackson would come to us and say, we hear you are going to vote for Mr. Adams; and the friends of Adams would come to us and say, we understand you are going to vote for Jackson, and so of the friends of Crawford; that we stand uncommitted, and we must know something about how the cabinet is to be filled. He left the City on the 8th in the evening, and had not ascertained before he left there, how the Kentucky delegation would vote. While at the City, Fr. Johnson said, in his presence, he had received a parcel of letters from home: he was asked what was the news? He replied, they say, stick to Old Hickory—give us a Western President whatever you do.

Doct. A. W. Bills, of Bourbon county, stated, that at Shumate's Tavern, in Millersburg, in the spring of 1825, in company with several persons, Gen. Metcalfe, upon being asked by witness, denied and disclaimed that there was any bargain, sale, or corruption, in the Presidential election, but did not doubt that there was a great deal of logrolling amongst the friends of all the candidates. Propositions he said, might have been made in a jocular manner, by the friends of the respective candidates for the Presidency, but that he knew nothing which was seriously intended. Witness then related the substance of the testimony of Mr. Hitt, as what had taken place between some person and a member of Congress from Kentucky. This seemed to attract the attention of the General very much, and he pressed witness to know which of the members had been said to have made such remarks, stating, that he felt solicitous to know to whom the allusion was, as he was unwilling to divide the responsibility. If attributed to him, he did not wish others to share it with him; if not, he wished to stand clear of the imputation. Through motives of delicacy, witness declined any definite explanation on account of the company present, with the intention, at a future time, to explain his allusions. Witness was, before the last Presidential election and still is, in favor of Gen. Jackson for the Presidency.

Joseph Miller was present at the conversation stated by Dr. Bills and confirmed his statement.

JOHN DESHA'S STATEMENT.

A statement of the conversation which took place between Gen. Metcalfe and John Desha, in the spring of 1825, in Carlisle, shortly after the General returned from Congress.

After the common salutation took place, I said: Well, General, you have made us a President.

He answered, yes.

Do you think the people of Kentucky will be pleased with your vote?

I think they will, when they hear my reasons.

What are your reasons, Sir?

Why, we could not possibly get Mr. Clay in the cabinet without voting for and electing Mr. Adams, and we could not do without Mr. Clay's talents.

I told him I thought very highly of Mr. Clay, but I supposed there were a good many equally qualified in the United States, and we could do without him if he were dead. But, General, did not General Jackson go into Congress with fifteen more votes than any other candidate?

Yes.

And besides, did not the Kentucky Legislature inform you that a majority of the people of the State wished you, if they could not get Mr. Clay elected, to certainly vote for General Jackson?

He answered, he thought he knew as well as the Legislature, as he left Kentucky some days after the Legislature had convened.

But, General, you could not know as well as they, as they were immediately from every county in the State.

Let it be as it may, I did as I pleased; and I have another reason.

What is that, General?

We might have been all the time engaged and have risen without making a President at all, without we elected Mr. Adams.

So much the better, I said, for then we would have Mr. Calhoun to administer the government, and I would much rather, and I believe the people of Kentucky would rather have him at the helm of government than Mr. Adams.

I refer you to Mr. John Miller, of Nicholas county, as he told me he (Metcalfe) gave him the very same reasons he gave me.

JOHN DESHA.

Nov. 17th, 1827.

Mr. Benning:

Sir—I am, and have been a long time, in a [illegible] of health. I write this before my departure down to [illegible] as I think it may be good for my health to travel. You [illegible] lish this if you think proper.

I am yours, &c.

JOHN DESHA.

STATEMENT.

I do certify, that some time previous to the last Presidential election, I heard David Trimble say, in a speech on the Court-house steps in Flemingsburg, that the elder John Adams was the most dangerous man in government in his day, and that young John Q. Adams was a chip of the old block, if any odds, worse; that in the treaty at Ghent, he wanted to barter away the navigation of the Mississippi, the key stone of the Western country, for a mess of Codfish; that he was always considered an apostate federalist; that he always had been hostile to the West, and that we never will have an equal chance with the eastern people, until we get a Western president; that we now have a chance in the West; for we have two candidates for the Presidency; and that he thought Henry Clay was the strongest; and if we could not get him, we have another chance in the West, to wit, Gen. Jackson

I believe the above to be the sum and substance of his speech, if not the precise words.

Richard R. Lee,
Turpley Taylor,
Charles Spencer,
Mordecai Williams,
T. W. Jones,
E. B. Early,
William Shockley,
Aquila Sampson,
Jesse Summers,
Col. John Taylor,
James Alexander.

September 21, 1827.

MR. HARRISON'S STATEMENT.

Afrer the most illiberal course pursued in the Senate by Mr. Hardin towards Mr. Harrison, we deemed it necessary to his own vindication before the world; that he should disclose what he knew. We accordingly addressed him a note, to which we received the following answer:

FRANKFORT, 7th Feb. 1828.

A. Kendall, Esq.

DEAR SIR—Your letter of this date is received. You state, that it is due to myself, as well as to my country, to say what I know upon the subject of the resolution which has been acted upon by the Senate, in regard to the late Presidential election.

I had refused to give evidence before the Senate, under the presumption of the communication being made to me *freely* and in confidence. I observed under this impression, the most scrupulous silence, during the last election, although opposed to the gentleman's election from whom I received it. Had a respectful politeness been observed towards me by an *honorable* Senator from Nelson, which a man deserving such an honor would have observed, I should not now disclose to you, and no doubt through you to the public, what I refused to disclose before the Senate. Without entering into *all* the minutæ of conversation which took place, I will state that the Hon. David Trimble observed to me, "that *we*, (meaning I supposed the Kentucky delegation) had *distinctly* ascertained, that if Mr. Adams were elected President, Mr. Clay would be appointed Secretary of State; and Gen. Jackson were elected President, Mr. Clay would not."

That in another conversation, not long previous to the last election, upon my observing to Mr. Trimble, that if Mr. Clay could have dismissed his prejudices against Gen. Jackson, and had him elected instead of Mr. Adams, General Jackson would not have been a candidate for re-election, in my opinion, and Mr. Clay would have been his successor. Mr. Trimble replied, "you are mistaken; that, although Gen. Jackson might not wish to serve a second term, yet, his friends would have impressed the necessity of his election; that the good of his country required it; for it is necessary that the President should be elected a second term to fill offices with his friends, or to place his friends in office."

The foregoing is substantially what I should have deposed to, had I been sworn before the Senate; and I regret, that the *extremely* illiberal observations made use of by *honorable* members of the Senate, have imposed the painful task of saying any thing upon this subject which may go to the public.

Sam respectfully, your ob't. serv't.

W. HARRISON.

J. DUDLEY'S STATEMENT.

J. Dudley, Esq. a Senator from Franklin and Owen counties, being called upon, made the following statement on the floor of the Senate. One day in January, 1825, F. P. Blair came into the Senate Chamber, seated himself near me, and inquired my opinion on the resolutions passed requesting our members of Congress to vote for General Jackson as President of the United States. Mr. B. desired that I would write letters requesting the members and particularly D. White, from this district, to consult with Mr. Clay and vote as he might desire. To this I objected, and gave my reasons therefor. Mr. B. appeared surprised that I should raise any objections, particularly as I was opposed to the resolutions. He said, that a number of members of both houses, who voted for the resolution, had written such letters, and that I could do it with more propriety. He said, if Mr. White could be induced to vote for Mr. Adams, he would obtain the vote of Kentucky, and with it the votes of most of the western States, which would elect him, in which case Mr. Clay would obtain the appointment of Secretary of State. I then inquired how that fact had been ascertained? His answer was, that letters had been received from gentlemen of undoubted veracity, at Washington City, containing such information, that I might rely with confidence on that statement. I replied that, although I was opposed to the resolutions, I had no doubt they contained the truth, and therefore I could not say one word to induce our members of Congress to believe otherwise. I further protested against Mr Clay's accepting any office under Mr. Adams, whom I considered a federalist of the Boston stamp, in 1798 and 1800, and thence forward an enemy of the west, and gave it as my opinion, that if they were united, they would sink together. I preferred that Mr. Clay should maintain the high attitude in which he then stood, by which means he would be the most prominent candidate at the next election.

EXTRACT of a letter from *Jesse Summers, Esq.* to *General Allen*, giving his reasons for not attending at the bar of the Senate, dated Fleming county, Kentucky, February 5th, 1828.

I have heard Mr. David Trimble say, it was ascertained that if John Q. Adams was elected President, he would appoint Henry Clay Secretary of State; and he also stated, in all probability, if General Jackson was elected, he would not. At the same time, Mr. Trimble stated, that the representatives from this State, or a majority of them, thought that it would be better for us to have John Q. Adams President and Henry Clay Secretary of State, than to have General Jackson President and some other person Secretary. This may not be verbatim what Mr. Trimble said; but in substance it is correctly what I understood him to say, according to the best of my recollection.

Mr. Trimble had made it necessary for him to give some explanation for his vote on the presidential election, on account of his having previously represented John Q. Adams to be a dangerous man, and an enemy to the western country. He said, that Adams had voted, at the treaty of Ghent, to give up the navigation

of the Mississippi to the British for a mess of codfish. Mr. Trimble having thus spoken of Mr. Adams previous to his voting for him, is what made me somewhat astonished at him for voting for the man he had so denounced, and I felt very anxious to hear his apology, and when it came it was in part as above stated.

N. B. The above statements can be proved, if necessary, by many witnesses in this congressional district.

Mr. Trimble stated, in his speech at Lewis court house, in October, 1825, that we, (the members of Congress, as was understood,) ascertained that if General Jackson was made President he would not make our friend, Henry Clay, his Secretary of State; but that if Mr. Adams was made President, he would make Mr. Clay his Secretary; and then said, if the people expected him to vote for Gen. Jackson under such circumstances, they expected from him what he could not and would not do. He said, that there was no other man in Kentucky who would do for a Secretary of State but Mr. Clay, and if Jackson were elected, Kentucky would have no voice in the cabinet.

HENRY HALBERT,
JESSE HAMRICK.

Feb. 9th, 1828.

Sworn to before me, a Justice of the Peace for Franklin county, this 9th day of Feb. 1828.

H. WINGATE, J. P.

From the Kentucky Central Watch Tower.

To the Editor:

WASHINGTON CITY, *Jan. 25th*, 1828.

SIR: In pursuance of your request, I have taken pains to inform myself, so far as it can be done from public documents, of the accuracy of the statements contained in the newspapers last summer, relative to Mr. Adams's accounts. To satisfy you, and that portion of my constituents who are readers of your paper, on the subject, I shall give literal extracts from the document now before me, accompanied with such explanatory remarks as the subject may seem to require. You will recollect, that when Mr. Adams was appointed to aid in negotiating the treaty of peace, he was Minister of the United States, at the Court of St. Petersburg, where he had been ever since 1809. It appears by the public documents, that his duties as minister to negotiate the peace, commenced 29th April, 1813, and ended the 27th February, 1815; having continued one year and ten months.

In the contingent account of Mr. Adams, laid before the House, February 21st, 1825, and printed in document 79, page 103, 2d volume public documents, 1824--5, are the following items:

1814, June 30th,	Expenses of a journey from "St. Petersburg to Ghent,	$ 886 86
Sept.	Expenses at Ghent,	1037 36
" Dec. 31,	do.	1384 65
1815, January,	do.	640 00

Here we have $3,062 01 for Mr. Adam's expenses at Ghent, for only three months. What was the nature of these expenses, has never been disclosed. An effort will be made at this session of Congress, to obtain an explanation of this most extraordinary expenditure. But let us return to the document.

"This sum allowed for his expenses, back to St. Petersburg, equal to the sum allowed on his journey from St. Petersburg to Ghent, $886 86." This journey *back to St. Petersburg*, Mr. Adams *never travelled*. He went from Ghent to Paris, and thence to London, where he remained about two years as minister, and then returned to the United States. This statement in the document, taken I presume from the books of the Treasury, is wholly deceptive—not as to the payment of the money, for Mr. Adams took care to secure that, but as to the services for which it was paid. So far as I can learn, the true history of this item is as follows: When Mr. Adams went to Ghent, he left his family in Russia, and after the close of that negotiation, they joined him at Ghent, and travelled to Paris. The travelling expenses of his family, from St. Petersburg to Paris, he charged to the United States; but the accounting officers of the Treasury could find no law which would justify or palliate the payment of this item. Whether the idea first occurred to them or Mr. Adams, I know not; but so it was, that inasmuch as Mr. Adams *might* have gone back to St Petersburg, although in fact he did not, it was considered, that the travelling expenses of his family from St. Petersburg to Paris, might be paid under cover of this pretended journey back, and neither Congress nor the people would be the wiser for it! So Mr. Adams received the money, under this false pretence. The accounting officers make a false corresponding entry upon the public books, and the consideration for which the money was paid, is wholly concealed in the report made to Congress; and the people, as well as their representatives, are deceived in relation to the real objects for which their money is paid. But let us again return to the document. The next item is as follows:

"This sum paid him for his travelling expenses from St. Petersburg to Amsterdam; from "thence to Ghent, Paris, and Havre, seeking a "passage to the United States; it being impossible to [illegible] from any port in the Baltic, "in consequence of the [illegible] $1,000."

Here is another journey paid for by the people, which requires explanation. It has been said, and probably with truth, that such a journey was performed by the Secretary of Legation, Wm. S. Smith, Mr. Adams's nephew. there is no law authorizing the allowance of travelling expenses to Secretaries of Legation; but Mr. Adams being Secretary of State, procured this extraordinary allowance, which is also disguised upon the books in the manner I have stated.

The next item reads thus: "This sum allowed him for his expenses at Paris, waiting the "answer of the British Government to a propo-"sition to treat on commerce, and the instruc-"tions of his own Government on this subject, $830 19."

These expenses were incurred at Paris, at the very time when Mr. Adams is supposed, in a previous and subsequent item of the account, to be travelling back to St. Petersburg; but the *dates* of these items are carefully omitted in the report to Congress. Had they been given, it would have appeared on the face of the document, that Mr. Adams was travelling back to St. Petersburg, and residing in Paris *at the same time*, and charging the Government with both the ex-

penses of his journey, and the expenses of his residence in Paris! It would seem that the dates could have been omitted only to conceal the falsehood of the pretences under which some of the items were allowed! It should be here remarked that Mr. Adams was allowed an outfit of $9,000 on his appointment to England, and that his salary for that mission, commenced on the 28th February, 1815, whereby he was receiving not only expense for travelling back to St. Petersburg, and expense for detention in Paris, but his salary as Minister to London, all at the same time!! The next item reads thus:

"This sum being the amount heretofore suspended from two contingent accounts, but which, on further explanation and consideration, is admitted, $99 35."

Of this I know nothing. But now comes a very extraordinary item:

"This sum, allowed him as equivalent to his expenses from Ghent to St. Petersburg, after the conclusion of the treaty of peace with Great Britain, he being accredited and considered Minister at the Russian Court until the receipt of his appointment to that of Great Britain, $1,566 54."

"Deduct this sum, allowed him for this object, for report No. 282, under an impression that the same sums charged by him for the journey from St. Petersburg to Ghent, would be equal to the expenses of his return, but which now appears would not have been the case, as that journey was made chiefly by water, but his return must have been by land, and by the same route as that taken by Messrs. Gallatin and Bayard, and equally expensive, 886 86, $679 68."

Here is another allowance for the journey back from Ghent to St. Petersburg, accompanied by the most disgusting and disgraceful falsehoods. As far as I can learn, the grounds of this second allowance were as follows: The travelling expenses of Mr. Adams' family, from St. Petersburg to Paris, were charged at the sum of 1,500 dollars, so that the first allowance of 886 dollars 86 cents to him under pretence of journey from Ghent to St. Petersburg, was not sufficient to cover them. After the first allowance was made, Mr. Adams discovered that Messrs. Bayard, and perhaps Gallatin, had charged and received 1,566 dollars 54 cents each, for the expenses of their journey from St. Petersburg to Ghent, and he forthwith puts in a further claim to an equal allowance for his *pretended* journey, in order to cover his family's travelling expenses! This also is allowed, deducting the previous allowance! Mark the false reasons given for this additional allowance! It is said Mr Adams's journey from St. Petersburg to Ghent, was made chiefly by water, "*but his return must have been by land,*" when, in fact, he never returned at all! It is added, "*and by the same route as that taken by Messrs Gallatin and Bayard, and equally expensive.*" A mere pretext for obtaining 679 dollars 68 cents more than it had cost him, by his own account for travelling over the same ground! From which it appears that the allowance of 886 dollars 86 cents originally made under false pretences, was afterwards enlarged to 1566 dollars 54 cents, under accumulated fictions! He finally gets, under pretence of a direct journey back to St. Petersburg from Ghent, which he never performed, as much as Mr. Bayard got for a circuitous journey from St. Petersburg by Ghent to London. How Mr. Adams could descend to procure from the public Treasury his family's travelling expenses, which he knew could not be legally allowed, by filling the records of his country with gross and repeated misstatements I leave to his supporters to explain!

When Mr. Adams was appointed to aid in negotiating the treaty of peace in April, 1813, the President sent out to him $13,500; 4,500 dollars on account of his salary as Minister to Russia, and 9,000 dollars as an outfit for the peace mission. Afterwards the President asked an appropriation by Congress to cover this outfit, but as the finances of the country were exhausted and embarrassed by the war, and 9,000 dollars outfit was considered rather extravagant for a Minister already in Europe, that body appropriated only 4,500 for Mr. Adams' outfit, and he was directed to enter a credit on his account in favor of the Government, equal to the other 4,500 dollars, the balance of the $9,000 sent him by the President. This he refused to do, complaining bitterly of Congress for their penuriousness, and declaring that they had as much right to confiscate his private property as to require him to refund any portion of the money which had been sent to him by the Government. He never did refund the money, or enter a credit for it, and he stood charged with it on the books of the Treasury until 1822. To compel defaulters to settle up their arrears with Government, Congress passed an act prohibiting the payment of any salary or compensation to any officer of the United States who was in arrears with the Government. Mr. Adams was then Secretary of State, and in obedience to law, the Treasury officers refused to pay him his salary until he accounted for this 4,500 dollars, which he had received in 1813. He now reiterated his complaints, and appealed to the President, who referred the subject to the Attorney General. That officer gave an opinion, that the President had a right to give the money, and Mr. Adams to keep it, in despite of the authority of Congress, and without an appropriation, although the Constitution says expressly, "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law," &c.

Mr. Adams retained the money and received the credit, although no appropriation has been made to this day. Thus it was, that he realized an outfit of 9,000 dollars, when sent upon the peace mission. The peace mission commenced the 29th of April, 1813, and ended the 27th of February, 1815, having continued one year and ten months. Mr. Adams was then appointed Minister to Great Britain, and his mission commenced 28th February, 1815. Upon this appointment, he claimed another outfit of 9,000 dollars. The Government hesitated at making the allowance, because there was an act of Congress which declared, "that it shall not be lawful in any case for the President to allow a Minister Plenipotentiary or Charge d' Affaires *on going from the United States* to any other foreign country, an outfit which shall exceed one year's salary." It was doubted whether any outfit could be lawfully allowed to a Minister who had been *actually fitted out*, and was already in a foreign country, upon a transfer from one court to an-

other. But it was finally decided that this law did not bar an outfit in such a case, and Mr. Adams received another 9,000 dollars on being transferred from Ghent to London. Thus did he receive, within two years, two outfits of 9,000 dollars each, making 18,000 dollars.

It has been said, that during the Ghent mission, Mr. Adams charged and received a double salary, viz. 9,000 dollars per year, as Minister to Ghent, and 9,000 dollars per year as Minister to Russia. The document on which this charge is predicated is now before me. It originated as follows: in April, 1822, the House of Representatives adopted a resolution, calling on the Secretary of State, who was none other than Mr. Adams himself, for "a statement exhibiting the amount paid for outfit, return, salaries, and contingent expenses, to each Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, and Charge des Affaires, from the United States to the respective foreign courts, from 1st January, 1801, to 31st December, 1821." Mr. Adams called on the Register of the Treasury to make out the document, which he accordingly did, and communicated it to Mr. Adams, by whom it was sent to the House of Representatives. This document contains the following account of the *amount paid* to Mr. Adams, as Minister to the several courts therein mentioned, which I have exactly copied:

	Outfit.	Return.	Salary.	Contingencies.	Total.
TO GREAT BRITAIN.					
John Q. Adams, from 28th February, 1815, to 10th June, 1817, -	$9,000	2,250	20,516 00	3,005 62	24,301 62
TO GHENT.					
John Q. Adams, from 28th April, 1813, to 27th February, 1815, -	9,000		20,220 31	6,345 60	15,351 60
John Q. Adams, from 9th August, 1809, to 27th February, 1813, -	9,000		30,104 69	5,153 54	64,697 51
TO PRUSSIA.					
John Q. Adams, from 1st Jan. 1801, to 25th April, 1801, -		2,250	2,860 27		5,110 27
RECAPITULATION.					
John Q. Adams Env. Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Prussia, from 1st January to 25th April, 1801.					
John Q. Adams, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, from 9th August, 1809, to 10th June, 1817—To Russia, -	27,000	4,500	73,510 27	14,504 76	119,014 03
To Ghent, -	9,000				
To Great Britain,	9,000				

I have copied all of this paper, just as it is printed in document No. 120, vol. 7, of public documents for 1821, '22. It will be perceived that the missions to Russia and Ghent are represented as ending at the same time, viz. 27th of February, 1815; that in the column of salary is placed a full salary as Minister to Ghent. If these statements be accurate, Mr. Adams did receive a double salary. But truth compels me to say, that this document, like others relating to Mr. Adams's accounts, is very inaccurate, if not materially false. In the main document, the totals do not correspond with the items, and the recapitulation does not with either the totals or the aggregate of the items in that document. I cannot therefore assert, positively, that Mr. Adams did receive a double salary, or that he did not, but when I reflect that this document, which seems contrived rather to conceal than develop the truth, came through his own hands, and must have passed his inspection, there seems to me reason to infer, that the worst representation it makes is the real truth of the case. Take this document coming through Mr Adams himself, as true in its worst aspect, and let us see how much money he contrived to pocket in two years, commencing with his appointment upon the Ghent Mission in April, 1813:

Outfit on the Ghent Mission,	$9,000 00
Salary do - -	20,220 31
Contingencies, do - -	6,345 60
Outfit on Mission to Great Britain,	9,000 00
Salary of Russian and Brit. Mission,	18,000 00
	$62,644 90

If this document be correct in the amount of Salary set to each Mission, Mr. Adams must have charged and received this sum for services and expenses between the 29th of April, 1813, and the 29th April, 1815, besides some contingencies at London. If indeed he did not receive any salary as Minister to Ghent, then the amount paid to him for the two years was 42,345 60. That he did actually receive this latter sum, much of it under false pretences and contrary to law, there is no room to doubt. What agency Mr. Adams had in settling his own accounts and directing the allowances to himself, I know not. Certain it is, that the Secretary of State is the chief agent in making all extraordinary allowances to foreign Ministers. Mr. Adams was Secretary of State from 1817 to 1825, and his accounts must have been settled after his return home. He at least did not object to the extravagant allowances made to him, some of them for services and journeys not performed, for he pocketed the money.

I have now given you all the information I can collect from the public documents upon the subject of your inquiry. You may rely upon it as accurate in the manner and to the extent that I have stated.

I cannot forbear to mention that in this investigation I have met with a key to the feelings which dictated the letter of Mr. Adams to Levitt Harris, in which he pronounces our Government *feeble and penurious*. Congress had refused to allow him a full outfit of 9000 dollars. In a letter to him from Mr. Monroe, then Secretary of State, dated June 25d, 1814, he is informed of this fact in the following words:

"It is necessary to apprize you, that, altho' "a full outfit was transmitted by the Neptune, "and intended to be allowed you by the Exec- "utive as a member of the extra mission at St. "Petersburg, yet the Legislature, on a refer- "ence of the subject to them for an appropria- "tion, decided the principle, by the amount ap- "propriated and the discussion which took place "at the time, that an outfit only could be allow- "ed to a Minister under circumstances applica- "ble to your case. In your drafts on the bank-

"ers and in your future accounts, you will be "pleased to keep this deduction in view."

But the Minister had the money, and although the Government was almost bankrupt, the army naked and starving, and the enemy, relieved from war in Europe, was preparing to carry fire and sword through our country, and did soon after take this city, and burn the public buildings, he had no conception of relinquishing his hold upon the cash he had received.—To Mr. Monroe's letter he returned an answer, dated Ghent, 23d August, 1814, characterized by a tone and temper ill becoming a representative of his country in that day of her greatest want and peril. Among other things of a like character, he says:

"I allege, that, by an act of the Executive "perfectly conformable to the constitution and "the law, the sum which I am now required to "deduct from my accounts and my drafts, was "my property as much as the dwelling house "of any member of the legislature was his, and "that the principle which Congress would set-"tle, by an ultimate refusal to allow the appro-"priation, could be no other than a principle, "to confiscate, without any alleged offence, "not half the outfit of a Minister under circum-"stances applicable to my case, but so much "of my individual property."

If I had more time I would give the whole letter, from which you would not fail to perceive, that Mr. Adams thought more of filling his own pockets at that period, than he did of the wants of his bleeding country.

His famous letter to Levitt Harris is dated Ghent, 16th November, 1814. Among other things not very creditable to his patriotism, he says:

"Divided among ourselves, more in passions "than interests, with half the nation sold by "their prejudices and their *ignorance* to our en-"emy, with a *feeble and penurious government*, "with five frigates for a navy, and scarcely five "efficient regiments for an army, how can it be "expected that we should resist the mass of "force which that gigantic power has collected "to crush us at a blow." You will recollect, sir, the events of that period. Our treasury was empty and the capitol in ruins, while Mr. Adams was grasping at outfits, salaries, travelling expenses and contingencies, without reason or limit, and abusing the Government as *penurious*, because it would not yield to all his extravagant demands! Mr. Monroe at Washington and General Jackson at New Orleans, were borrowing on their own credit, and hazarding every dollar they possessed in the world, to save their suffering country. In November 1814, when the letter to Harris was written, General Jackson was driving the British from Florida, and opening his way to New Orleans. On the 1st of December he arrived at that City, and used to the people a language which I beg you to contrast with that of Mr. Adams. He declared "*that who is not for us is against us*," he informed those whom he commanded or was to defend, "*to remember that our watchword is victory or death: our country must and shall be defended. We will enjoy our liberty or perish in the last ditch.*"

Your obedient servant,

T. P. MOORE.

Our readers are here presented with the first number of the United States' Telegraph Extra, which is dedicated to all those citizens of the United States who, at the elevation of the Hero of New Orleans to the most responsible station in their gift, expect a correction of existing abuses, and an honest administration of their public affairs. More particularly is this paper dedicated to the different corresponding committees throughout the Union, who have been appointed for the purpose of disseminating political truth, and refuting the various slanders by which, a corrupt coalition are endeavoring to prolong that power which they acquired by violating the public will. The publishers believe that a paper like the one here offered, on terms that shall render it accessible to every citizen, will tend greatly to promote the cause of the PEOPLE. *The patronage already given to it is extensive, and greatly increasing; and to meet this increasing demand, they intend to print a large edition of the first numbers, to accommodate therewith those whose orders may not arrive until after their publication.*

All the corresponding committees, and all those disposed to aid the cause of sound principles by the election of ANDREW JACKSON, *are requested to exert themselves for procuring subscribers, and transmitting their names to the publishers without delay. They will perceive that, to indemnify the Editors for the expense of publication, all payments should be made in advance, and that they can, in no case, pay postage.*

The editors would suggest to those who obtain subscribers, the propriety of retaining the money paid to them, until it shall amount to five dollars at least; for, besides the saving of postage to subscribers, the editors would state that, bills of a lesser denomination than five dollars are not current in Washington, unless they be on the District Banks.

The Editors improve the opportunity afforded by this publication, to inform their patrons that, of the United States' Telegraph, they publish four papers. The first is a Daily Paper, which is offered for Ten Dollars per year. The second is published three times per week during the session of Congress, and twice per week during the recess; and is offered for Five Dollars per year, and Three Dollars for six months. The third is published Weekly, and is offered for Four Dollars per year. If three subscribers unite and remit ten dollars, each will receive a Weekly Paper for one year. The fourth will be published weekly, from the 1st of March until the 15th of October, for One Dollar.

Concerning the political doctrines to the support of which this paper will be devoted, the editors need say nothing. The course hitherto pursued in the United States' Telegraph, will be strictly pursued in this Extra: and how far that course has been approved by the great Republican party of the Union, may be learned from the extensive, if not unexampled patronage which the editors have received from the people and the subscribers, and the malignant abuse that has been poured upon them by the agents of the coalition.

GREEN & JARVIS.

☞ We invite the public attention to the letter of the Hon. Thomas P. Moore, Member of Congress from Kentucky, concerning the accounts of our *disinterested* and *patriotic* President.

UNITED STATES TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*,

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, MARCH 21, 1828. No. 2.

SIX MILITIAMEN.

The Editors of the United States' Telegraph believing that they could not render a more acceptable service to their readers, than by placing within a compendious compass the facts and principles of Law connected with the case of the "Six Tennessee Militia men," have prepared, and now publish in a pamphlet, from the report of the Committee on Military Affairs, and the debate which took place in the House of Representatives, on the 11th February, relative to the printing of that report and the documents transmitted by the Department of War in obedience to the call of Mr. Sloane, of Ohio.

The annals of the world scarcely disclose a circumstance of greater baseness and injustice than the conduct of the Coalition, and its tools, throughout the whole of this transaction. It will be remembered by our readers that it was immediately after the decided revolution in public sentiment, occasioned by the moral disgust and loathing at the infuriate and infamous attacks on the character of Mrs. Jackson, that this fiction of General Jackson's illegal execution of the six militia men was got up, and that Binns, *par excellence*, the infamous Binns, forged the memorable letter of John Harris. Although the report of the Nashville Committee put down this fabrication, and suspended this slander for a time, yet the Secretary of War, as the supple instrument of a more designing man than himself, was too far committed in the dissemination of this calumny to recede, and having consented to become the carrier of John Binns, he was obliged also to be his endorser.

The consequence has been, that the archives of the War Department have been opened to every libeller of General Jackson, who might desire to find materials to be tortured and perverted to the worst purposes of falsehood and malice. But the chief manœuvre in the tactical operation of this movement, was to procure, during the present session, a call for the proceedings of the court by which the six militia men were sentenced to death, and such parts of the correspondence of the Department of War with the Governor of Tennessee, during the late war, relating to the militia drafts of that State, as might be most serviceable.

The object of this call was too obvious to escape observation. In the first place it was hoped, that from the carelessness and want of method which usually characterize the proceedings of militia courts-martial, (however effectually substantial justice may be done,) some irregularity of mere form might be seized upon and made the most of; at all events, (whatever might be the finding of the court, from the testimony of the witnesses for the prisoners, enough might be procured for the calumnious aliment of "the Press, by authority," during the approaching campaign.

This call was confided to the Honorable Mr. Sloane, of Ohio. It was impossible for the Coalition to have made a more judicious selection. This gentleman, with a happy insensibility both to shame and punishment, had just that darkling malice which fitted him "for a mousing owl;" and in strict obedience to the orders he had received, the call was so shaped by himself, as to bring out merely what the Coalition wanted. The seasonable amendment, however, of Mr. Wickliffe, extracted a little more, and this enabled the Committee on Military Affairs to develop the true history of the transaction. When the call was answered by the transmission of the documents from the War Department, it will be remembered with what pertinacity the friends of the Administration resisted their reference to the Committee on Military Affairs, because they knew that that Committee would give a candid and fair exposition of the law and facts of the case; and that, as the proceedings of the court did not contain a recital of the law under which it acted, the public would be sure to be misled if it was not pointed out.

We need not refer to the dishonorable course pursued by the administration party when the Committee presented their report—the efforts made to separate this report from the documents, and the still more reprehensible attempt to have them published as *arranged, assorted*, and *shuffled* at the Department of War. These facts the debate will emphatically disclose.

We regret that the documents sent by the Department are so voluminous as to preclude our publication of them, for with the tabular statements of the muster-rolls they are equivalent to about 200 printed pages; but what will the public say, when we assure them, that but one single letter, (that of the Secretary of War, General Armstrong, to Governor Blount, of the 11th of January, 1814,) has any reference to the subject, excepting that from Gov. Blount to the Secretary of War of the 19th Oct. 1814, that all the rest of the correspondence serves only to overwhelm in its unwieldy masses the true point at issue which the administration has been desirous of keeping out of view.

The muster-rolls, it is impracticable to publish; they prove, however, unequivocally, that the men who were executed, were regularly mustered for *six months*. For a perfect understanding of the references in the report, we here subjoin the letter of Gen. Armstrong to Gov. Blount, of the 11th of January, 1814.—Gov. Blount's order of the 20th May, 1814, by which the regiment of Col. Pipkin was mustered into service for six months, from the 20th of June, 1814. General Jackson's order of the 24th May, 1814, who was then a Militia General, the letter of the Secretary of War, August 20th, 1814, (communicated to the House of Representatives, under Mr. Sloane's second call of the 8th of February,) together with the letter of the Hon. Mr. Blair, of Tennessee, trans-

inting a letter of the Hon. Mr. Alexander, in relation to the execution of the six mutineers.

The Secretary of War to Governor Blount.

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Jan.* 11, 1814.

SIR: You are authorized to supply, by militia drafts, or by volunteers, any deficiency which may arise in the militia division, under the command of Major General Jackson, and without referring, on this head, to this Department. It may be well that your Excellency should consult General Pinckney on such occasions, as he can best judge of the whole number necessary to the attainment of the public objects.

I have the honor, &c.

J. ARMSTRONG.

His Excy the Governor of Tennessee.

And again, on the 31st of January, 1814, he wrote:

"SIR: I had the honor to receive your Excellency's letter of the 5th inst. My letter of the 11th will have anticipated your inquiries relative to further detachments of militia. The attention of the Paymaster of the Army will be particularly directed to the payment of the troops who have been in service from Tennessee.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your excellency's most obedient servant,

(Signed) J. ARMSTRONG."

His Excellency W. BLOUNT,
Governor of Tennessee.

The Secretary of War to General Jackson.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
February 4, 1814.

SIR: Since the receipt of your letter, of December 30th, the Governor of Tennessee has been required to call out the militia to reinforce your command, and provide for the exigencies of the service in that quarter, in which he is also required to consult the commanding General.

J. ARMSTRONG.

General ANDREW JACKSON,
Fort Strother.

Acting, as we presume, under those instructions, the Governor of Tennessee, on the 20th of May, 1814, issued the following general order:

"NASHVILLE, May 20, 1814.

SIR: In compliance with the requisition of Major General Thomas Pinckney, that the posts of Fort Williams, Fort Strother, Fort Armstrong, Fort Ross, and Forts Old and New Deposit, should be kept up, the doing of which he has confided to you, until the objects of the government in relation to the war against the hostile Creek Indians shall have been fully effected; and from the probable expiration of the time of service of the troops, now occupying those important posts, commanded by Col. Bunch, prior to a final accomplishment of the views of government in relation to the Creek war, *you will, without delay, order out one thousand militia infantry of the 2d division, for the term of* SIX MONTHS, unless sooner discharged by order of the President of the United States, or you may accept a tender of service of the above number of volunteer infantry from the 2d division for the aforesaid term, for the purpose of garrisoning the said posts, at your option: *which latitude, in relation to calls for men to act against the Creeks, in furtherance of the views of government in that behalf, is given to me by instructions from the War Department.* Those troops will be commanded by an officer of the rank of colonel, and will be required to rendezvous at Fayetteville, on the 20th of June next: thence they will proceed to the above-mentioned posts, under your order, in such number to each, as you shall assign. It is important to the public interests that they should be at those posts between the 1st and 10th of July next, as about that time the term of service of the troops, now there, under colonel Bunch, will expire, and at which posts there is much public property committed to their charge.

You will order the muster master to attend and muster the troops into service—you will call on the contractor for provisions, and on the assistant deputy quartermaster likewise for supplies in his department.

(Signed) WILLIE BLOUNT."

To Maj. Gen. ANDREW JACKSON,
Second division of Tennessee Militia."

General Jackson, then a Major General in the Militia of the State, issued his order on the 24th day of May, 1814, as follows:

"*Brave Tennesseeans of the 2d Division.* The Creek war, through the Divine aid of Providence, and the valor of those engaged in the campaign, in which you bore a conspicuous share, has been brought to a happy termination. Good policy requires that the territory conquered should be garrisoned, and possession retained until appropriated by the Government of the United States. In pursuance of this policy, and to relieve the troops now stationed at forts Williams, Strother, and Armstrong, on the Coosa river, as well as Old and New Deposit, I am commanded by his excellency, Governor Blount, to call from my division one thousand men in the service of the United States, for the period of six months, unless sooner discharged by order of the President of the United States.

The Brigadier Generals, or officers commanding the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 9th Brigades of the 2d division, will forthwith furnish from their brigades respectively, by *draft* or *voluntary enlistment*, two hundred men, with two captains, two first, two second, and two third lieutenants, and two ensigns, well armed and equipped for active service, to be rendezvoused at Fayetteville, Lincoln county, in the State of Tennessee, on the 20th of June next; and then be organized into a regiment, at which place the field officers, and muster-master will be ordered to meet them.

Officers commanding the brigades composing the 2d division of Tennessee militia, are charged with the prompt and due execution of this order.

ANDREW JACKSON, *Maj. Gen.*
Commanding 2d division, M. T."

The Secretary of War to General Jackson.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
August 20, 1814.

SIR: Yours of the 24th July, has been received. Fort Jackson should not be abandoned

General Pinckney reports, that he has maintained the garrisons in his district, where he has three companies posted, and he has been instructed to continue them so long as he shall deem the measure advisable.

If the report of your runner be true, a new military force from Tennessee should be called out. Governor Blount has orders to hold in readiness twenty five hundred detached militia, and will be prepared for such an event.

I have the honor, &c.

JOHN ARMSTRONG.

General Jackson.

Under this call, Harris and his associates were mustered into service for six months, on the 29th of June, 1814, and deserted on the 20th of September following: Col. Pipkin says that, "A short time previous to this *(the 20th of "September)* the same party demolished the "bake house, destroyed the oven, and did ma "ny other disorderly and mutinous acts. The "day previous to their desertion, a large num- "ber paraded armed, and marched towards the "commissary stores. I ordered them to dis- "perse, but my order was disregarded, and "they forced the guards stationed for the pro- "tection of the stores. The Commissary anti- "cipated their design, closed and locked the "door; but that did not restrain them; for one "of the men, (who was afterwards shot by sen- "tence of the court martial,) immediately "snatched up a pick-axe and cut the door off "its hinges. They then entered the house, "and took out eleven barrels of flour, and made "public proclamation to all who intended go- "ing home, to come forward and draw rations; "which they did.—They afterwards proceeded "to the bullock pen, and shot down two "beeves, and the balance taking fright, broke "the pen and ran some distance, where they "killed a third."

HALL OF REPRESENTATIVES, }
February 24th, 1828. }

Messrs. GREEN AND JARVIS:

Gentlemen—Enclosed I send you for publication, an extract from a letter, (partly on business,) addressed by D. Alexander, Esq. to me, in relation to the subject of the six militiamen. I am personally and intimately acquainted with Mr. Alexander, and know him to be a man of highly respectable character and unquestionable veracity. He is a member of the Tennessee bar, and Clerk of the Chancery Court in the district which I have the honor to represent.—From the part which he took in the transactions of which he speaks, I feel confident that his statement will be calculated to arrest the current of falsehood, which has been industriously propagated on that subject.

Very respectfully, your ob't serv't.

JOHN BLAIR.

Extract from D. Alexander's letter.

"I have read with indignation the resolution of Mr. Sloane of Ohio, with regard to the six militia men, and his remarks thereon.—— The truth is, Jackson would have been very much to blame, had he disapproved of the sentence of the Court Martial. At the time of the execution of these men, and for some days before and after, the British were just below us, at the Point, threatening an attack: and the militia under Gen. Winchester were threatening to mutiny (at least to go home,) but when an example was made of these mutineers, which they acknowledged to be just, not a murmur was heard escape the lips either of the militia or regulars; on the contrary, all said that they would remain even for a longer time than six months, should their services be required. I know all about this matter. I was acting as Adjutant in Forte Charlotte, at Mobile, commanded the guard which escorted the six militiamen, and one regular, to the place where the Army, consisting of the Tennessee and Georgia troops were assembled, for the purpose of witnessing their execution; and the example had the most salutary effect, as it prevented another mutiny. We were, at that time, in great want of provisions, our communication with Orleans being cut off, and our supplies having failed from above. All the officers both of the regular and militia, approbated the conduct of Gen. Jackson, because they saw and felt the necessity of making an example, as we had not heard of the news of peace, nor did that information reach us for many days after the execution of these men. As to the celebrated letter of Harris, it is a base fabrication. I was quartered in front, and within ten or twelve feet of the Calaboose or Prison in which Harris and his accomplices were confined, and he could not have written any letter without the knowledge and leave of the officers: he never did write such a letter, nor was he capable of doing so: nor did he ever mention to any one in the fort, that I ever heard of, that he was desirous of making an application to Gen. Jackson for a pardon; on the contrary, he always acknowledged the justice of the Court that condemned him. This miserable fabrication shows the disposition of the enemies of Gen. Jackson. There never was a more unfounded, vile fabrication, than this much talked of Harris letter. I never heard an intimation made, whilst I was at Mobile, or during my continuance in the army, nor until Binns started it."

We think that, after a careful perusal of the report of the Committee, the debate in the House of Representatives, and the documents we have here published, that every candid mind must, at least, settle down in the following conclusions:—

1st. That Governor Blount had full power under the unrevoked discretionary instructions of the War Department of the 11th of January, 1814, to call out militia drafts for six months.

2dly That Col. Pipkin's regiment, to which the six militiamen belonged, was so called out.

3dly. That these mutineers committed the crimes for which they were executed, before the expiration of three months of their term of service, and that there is as little doubt of the enormity of their guilt, as of the regularity of their trial, and the justice of their fate.

And, lastly, that the conduct of the Coalition in every stage of the atrocious calumny which they have endeavored to superinduce on a transaction which devolved a most painful responsibility on an estimable public servant, has been marked by a recklessness for truth and honor, and an unfaltering devotion to duplicity and malice, that has entirely eclipsed all other parrallels of human depravity and baseness.

TENNESSEE MILITIAMEN.

MR. HAMILTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which the subject had been referred, made the following report:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the documents communicated by the Secretary of War, in obedience to the call of this House, of the 16th of January, relative to the proceedings of a Court Martial, which commenced its sitting at or near Mobile, on the 5th of December, 1814, for the trial of certain Tennessee Militiamen, together with the correspondence between the Governor of that State and the Secretary of War, respecting the length of service of militia drafts, of that State, during the late war, report:

That, by the reference of these papers to your Committee, they have been unable to place any other construction on your order, than, that it was the intention of the House, that they should examine the same, and determine whether all the documents had been communicated, or were on file in the Department, necessary to a true understanding of the case to which the call for these documents is applicable; and, if any were wanting, to ascertain in what manner the deficient papers could be supplied; and, in reporting upon the nature of the transactions, which these papers disclose, to determine whether the legislative interference of Congress be necessary, as to any amendment, either of the Rules and Articles of War, or the laws governing the militia of the United States.

In the discharge of this duty, your Committee will proceed succinctly to state to the House, the character of the documents transmitted by the Department of War; the periods and events to which they are applicable; the law and public exigency under which the Governor of Tennessee, during the last war, ordered out the militia drafts of that State, for the common defence of our country; and, lastly, the crimes and offences committed by a portion of the militia drafts so ordered out, which produced a necessity for the examples which were made, and which are disclosed in the proceedings of the Court Martial, convened at or near Mobile, on the 5th of December, 1814.

The first criticism to which the correspondence transmitted, in obedience to the order of this House, by the Department of War, is liable, is the numerical classification, made by that Department, of the letters composing this correspondence.

The Secretary of War has transmitted twelve letters, which passed between the then Secretary, General Armstrong, and Governor Blount. Instead of commencing the series with the letter first in date, by which the inducement would be shown for the reply, this order is inverted, and the series commences with a letter from the Secretary of War, of the 3d of January, 1814, marked No. 1; and his letters are continued to No. 5. It so happens, that the first letter in date, is as low down as No. 6, Gov. Blount's of the 10th of December, 1813; and the second letter in date, is No. 7—Governor Blount's, of the 24th of the 3d of January, 1814, of the Secretary of War, is an answer.

Your Committee believe that this arrangement of the correspondence, is calculated to lead to serious misapprehension; that a reader, not very attentive to a comparison of dates, would suppose that the letter of the 3d of January, 1814, referred to such militia drafts as were to be made in that year, when it is exclusively applicable to the drafts which had been made in 1813, for the prosecution of the Creek war, and which were admitted to have been executed but for three months. The injustice which, by a confusion of dates, would be done, even by possibility, to the parties concerned in the transactions of the militia drafts of Tennessee, which were made for six months in 1814, by applying the letter of the Secretary of War, of the 3d of January, 1814, to subsequent drafts for six months, instead of those which were made in 1813, for three months, has induced your Committee so to arrange the correspondence, that the leading letter, in the series, should come out first, and the subsequent letters follow in the natural order of their respective dates. This obviously just classification being observed, it will be perceived, that the letter of the 3d of January, 1814, has no bearing upon the drafts of militia, which were afterwards made for six months, in the progress of that year, by the Governor of Tennessee, of which the regiment under the command of Col. Pipkin composed a part.

A perusal of the correspondence just recited, of the muster rolls of the different companies of Col. Pipkin's regiment, and the proceedings of the Court Martial which was convened "at Mobile, on the 5th of December, 1814, for the trial of certain Tennessee militiamen," present upon their face the following inquiries:

1st. Whether the Governor of Tennessee, had the power to order out detachments of the militia of that State for a six months' tour of service?

2dly. Whether Col. Pipkin's regiment was so ordered out, and in conformity with such authority?

3dly. Whether the soldiers of this regiment, who were arraigned for certain crimes and offences before "a Court Martial, which convened at Mobile on the 5th December, 1814," were legally tried; and whether the commanding General, approving the proceedings of this Court, properly exercised the power and discretion vested in him by law?

In relation to the first branch of the inquiry, it will be proper to premise, that, on the 10th April, 1812, in anticipation of the war about to take place, Congress passed an act, which will be found in the 4th vol. of the Laws of the United States, page 406, which authorizes the President "to require the different Executives of the States, to organize their respective proportions of 100,000 militia, and to call into service the whole, or a part, of these quotas; which detachments were not compelled to serve longer than six months, after they arrived at the place of rendezvous." This act was an enlargement of the act of 1795, which restricted the service of the militia, when called out by the authority of the United States, to three months.

The act of the 10th of April, 1812, expired

On the 11th of January, 1814, whilst, however, this law was in full force, the then Secretary of War, Gen. Armstrong, wrote the letter, numbered 2 in the documents, to Governor Blount, which authorizes him "to supply, by militia drafts, or by volunteers, any deficiency which may arise in the militia division under the command of Major General Jackson, and *without referring, on this head, to this Department;*" and further informs Governor Blount that "it may be well that your Excellency consult General Pinckney on such occasions, as he can best judge of the whole number necessary to the attainment of the public objects."

This letter, in the opinion of your Committee, vested plenary power in Governor Blount, until it was revoked, either by express orders, or by peace, to call out such militia drafts as, in his discretion, he might think necessary "for the attainment of the public objects," under the existing laws.

On the 18th of April, 1814, 4th Vol. Laws of the United States, page 703, sec. 8, Congress enacted "that the militia, when called into the service of the U. States, by virtue of the before recited act, may, if, in the opinion of the President of the U. States, the public interest require it, be compelled to serve for a term not exceeding six months, after their arrival at the place of rendezvous, in any one year. This law was to continue in force during the war.

After the passage of this act, it does not appear that the President revoked the power which he had given to Gov. Blount, by virtue of the letters of the Secretary of War, of the 11th and 31st January, 1814; but he seems to have been willing, from his silence, coupled with the notorious fact of Gov. Blount's continuing to order out militia drafts, under the discretionary authority of those letters, to consider that such drafts as Gov. Blount should order out, were, in his opinion, required "by the *public interest.*"

And your Committee think, that this proposition may be put more affirmatively, to wit: that it was the "opinion of the President, that the public interest did require" that Governor Blount should, under the advisement, or by the requisitions of Gen. Pinckney, have the power to order out militia drafts, either for three or six months, as the exigencies of the service should render necessary, "*without referring, on this head,*" to the President for special directions.

This deduction they consider irresistible and conclusive, and that there was nothing in the act of April 18th, 1814, which prevented the President from expressing his opinion, through general instructions, to the Executive of a State, whose orders for militia drafts, under such discretion, should, *de facto* and *de jure*, be the opinion of the President, "that such drafts were required by the public interest."

This inference, your Committee moreover believe, if they thought it necessary to go into such an investigation, might be sustained by the contemporary constructions which were given to this clause in the act of April, 1814, in the actual discretion which was vested in the Executives of several of the States.

2dly. Your Committee are now brought to inquire, whether Colonel Pipkin's regiment was ordered out for six months, and in conformity with the above cited authority? It appears, by the muster rolls, that this regiment was regularly inspected, and mustered into service for six months, to wit: on the twentieth of June, 1814; and that, consequently, their term of service expired on the morning of the twentieth of December, 1814. In the absence of all other proof, these records are to be considered as the highest evidence, not only of the fact, but of the legal presumption, that the muster and inspection were made with the requisite authority.

But it is a circumstance of public and indisputable notoriety, and one which belongs to the history of the country, that Col. Pipkin's detachment was mustered into service *expressly for six months*, by virtue of an order of Governor Blount, dated the 20th of May, 1814; a certified copy of which, your Committee have taken steps to procure, that it may be placed on the files of this House, with the documents from the War Department.

This order recited that the draft was made in compliance "with the requisition of Major General Pinckney, and in furtherance of the views of Government, by a latitude given to him (Gov. Blount) by the War Department, in regard to calls for men to act against the Creeks." This draft was ordered to rendezvous on the 20th of June, 1814, at Fayetteville, Tennessee; and formed the identical detachment of one thousand men, who were afterwards placed under the command of Col. Pipkin, and stationed in the summer and autumn of that year, at the posts in the Creek country. And, by reference to Gov. Blount's letter of the 19th October, 1814, (No 11,) it will be seen that he specially reported this regiment of one thousand men, to the Secretary of War, as in service *for six months;* from which fact, the inference is inseparable, that the President considered it as legally in service, or it was the bounden duty of the Secretary to have ordered their immediate discharge: which, it no where appears that he ever did. If, therefore, any confirmation was wanted for the original authority by which the draft was made for six months, your Committee consider that Gov. Blount's report, of the 19th October, and the implied sanction of the President, incontestably furnish it.

3dly. Whether the soldiers of Col. Pipkin's regiment, who were arraigned for certain crimes and offences before a Court Martial, which convened at Mobile, on the 5th of December, 1814, were legally tried; and whether the Commanding General, approving the proceedings of this Court properly exercised the power and discretion vested in him by law?

By reference to the proceedings of the Court Martial in question, it will be seen, that two commissioned officers, and about 200 of the non-commissioned officers and privates of Colonel Pipkin's regiment, were tried for the most serious offences which can be committed in the military service of the country.

That these offences, first, consisted in "exciting and causing mutiny;" secondly, in the commission of an actual mutiny, accompanied by circumstances of aggravated robbery and spoliation of the public stores; and, thirdly, in the crime of desertion.

The two first of these offences, to wit: "exciting and causing a mutiny," and actually committing mutiny, "by forcing the guard

and seizing the Commissaries' storehouse and stores, at Fort Jackson, were committed, the first, before the 19th of September, 1814; and, second, on the 19th of September, 1814; and before even *three months' service of this detachment had expired.* That some of the mutineers were deluded into a belief that they were about to be wrongfully detained in service, beyond the term for which they were legally drafted, your Committee think not improbable; and those who were thus likely to be deluded, the Court recommended to the clemency of the commanding General, who, it appears, pardoned them; and that all the rest of the mutineers and deserters were condemned to trivial punishments, neither affecting life nor limb, excepting six of the ringleaders, to wit: David Morrow, a sergeant in Capt. Strother's company, Jacob Webb, John Harris, Henry Lewis, David Hunt, and Edward Linsey, privates in Colonel Pipkin's regiment, who were found guilty either of causing, or exciting a mutiny, before the 19th September, 1814, or committing a mutiny, or deserting whilst on post, before the expiration of the 19th of September, 1814, and suffered death in consequence.

By an examination of the trials of these six ringleaders, it will be seen, that they were *prominently* guilty, either of "exciting and causing a mutiny," or of being the leaders of a mutiny; the first before, and the last on, the 19th of September, 1814: and that John Harris, to whose name such remarkable notoriety has been attached, was engaged some time prior, "in causing and exciting a mutiny," by carrying even a muster roll of mutiny and desertion throughout the camp, to procure the names of those who were willing, and would pledge themselves to commit these crimes.

To these facts, your Committee will now apply the law. The act of 1795, provides, "that the militia in the service of the United States shall be governed by the Rules and Articles of War." By the 7th article of the Rules and Articles of War, "any officer or soldier, who shall "begin, excite, or join in any mutiny or sedi- "tion, in any troop or company in the service "of the United States, or in any party, post, "detachment, or guard, shall suffer death, or "such other punishments, as, by a Court Mar- "tial, shall be inflicted." By the 8th article, a similar penalty is awarded, where any officer or soldier "does not use his utmost endeavors "to suppress a mutiny, or, coming to the "knowledge of an intended mutiny, does not, "without delay, give information thereof to "his commanding officer." And, by the 20th article, the crime of desertion, is punishable "by death, or such other punishments, as, by "sentence of a Court Martial shall be inflicted."

These facts, and these principles, furnish a complete vindication of the Court, whose painful duty it was to condemn six of their fellow-citizens to a severe and ignominious punishment.

But if all the reasoning of your Committee was absurd and valueless, as to the fact, that these men were rightfully in service for six months, and it were even admitted that they were drafted but for three months, the proceedings of the Court would stand without spot, blame, or legal impeachment. As the crimes for which these unfortunate human beings suffered death, were committed before three months of their term of service had expired: and by the 12th section of the act of the 18th April, 1814, which was then in full force, and which provides, "that any commissioned officer, non-commissioned officer, musician, or private, of the militia of the United States, who shall have committed an offence, while in actual service of the United States, may be tried and punished for the same, although his term of service may have expired, in like manner as if he had been actually in the service of the United States;" it is, therefore, obvious that these men could be legally detained for trial and punishment, even if they could have been considered as in service but for three months.

That they had a fair and impartial trial, your committee see no reason to doubt, and the mere fact of their jurors being their own officers, fellow citizens, and, probably, neighbors, secured the presence of that sympathy which leads to the most merciful interpretation (where it is just to apply it) of the conduct and motives of others.

That General Jackson, commanding in chief, in the Military Division, in which these events transpired, properly exercised the power and discretion vested in him, by law, by approving the proceedings of this Court, your committee, likewise, perceive no reason to doubt. It is true, that they were approved on the 22d of January, fourteen days after the victory of the 8th, by which the enemy had been repulsed from the Mississippi. But the General was, at this time, ignorant of the pacification at Ghent; and, moreover, must have been apprized that a part of the enemy had gone round, and had concentrated his forces in the neighborhood of Mobile, in that very vicinity where these outrageous acts of insubordination, mutiny, and desertion, had taken place. That such a concentration of the enemy's forces was effected, is a fact beyond all dispute, as, on the 11th of February, Fort Boyer was attacked and captured.

The Commanding General must, also, have known that it was on volunteer or militia drafts the defence of the Southern coast would rest; whilst the flagrant mutinies and desertions in the campaign of 1813, of the militia drafts of that year, must have admonished him of the necessity of striking a severe, yet salutary, example in the minds of those who were liable to be misled.

Although the clemency of the General was not invoked by the Court, it is true, he might have pardoned these victims of their own crimes; but there are occasions when mercy is but another name for weakness: when even a severe and unalterable firmness in the discharge of our duty, is the most perfect justice we can render to our country.

The examples of this stern and enlightened justice, are scattered throughout the pages of History, not for the abhorrence, but the respect of mankind; they are found, not only in the most instructive morals which the lessons of antiquity afford, but they illustrate the incomparable services of him, who was, and ever will be venerated, as "the Father of our Country."

In conclusion, your committee will barely remark, that, as the acts of 1812 and 1814, expired, the one by its own limitation, and the other by the termination of the war, they see nothing in the transaction, which it has been

their duty to examine, from its origin to its close, which calls for the legislative interference of this House, in the shape of any amendment to the Rules and Articles of War, or to the existing laws governing the militia whilst in the service of the United States.

From the Doylestown Democrat.

DAYS OF YORE.

The administration prints are still busily engaged in endeavoring to mislead the public mind respecting General Jackson's past life, and particularly that part of it which relates to his conduct during the late war. We have therefore thought it but justice due the character of Gen. Jackson, to lay before the public some sketches of the history of our country, in order to show how far that great patriot has become the victim of malicious persecution.

It is well known to those who are acquainted with the history of the American Revolution, that General Washington and the officers under his command, pursued the most high handed measures which, in the end, effectuated the independence of the country, and finally gained them the lasting gratitude of every friend to American freedom. We now have before us a proclamation issued by Gen. Washington, from head-quarters, Morristown, New Jersey, in the winter of 1777, in which he orders "That all found guilty of desertion, shall be punished with death;" and Marshall's Life of Washington states, that while the army was quartered here, executions for desertion were frequent. A mutiny brok out at Fort Schuyler,* in the State of New York, in the year 1780, and thirty-one of the men of that garrison marched off in a body. Being pursued by order of Gen. Washington, 16 of them were overtaken, and 13 of the sixteen were instantly killed. In the year 1781, one hundred and sixty of the Jersey troops mutined. The American general, Howe, with a considerable force, was ordered to take methods for reducing them to obedience. Convinced that there was no medium between dignity and servility but coercion; and that no other remedy could be applied without the deepest wound to the service, he determined to proceed against them with decision. General Howe marched from Kingwood about midnight, and by the dawning of day had his men in four different positions, to prevent the revolters from making their escape. Every avenue being secured, Col. Barber was sent to them, with orders to parade immediately without arms, and to march to a particular spot of ground. Some hesitation appearing among them, Col. Sproat was directed to advance, and only five minutes were given to the mutineers to comply with the orders which had been sent them. This had its effect; and they, to a man, marched without arms to the appointed ground. The officers gave a list of the leaders of the revolt, upon which Gen. Howe desired them to select three of the greatest offenders. A field court martial was immediately held upon these three, and they were unanimously sentenced to death. Two of them were executed on the spot, and the executioners were selected from among the most active in the mutiny. It should be recollected, that at the periods to which we have referred, the American army was in the most distressed condition, many of the men were kept in service beyond the periods for which they had engaged to serve—no pay, and scarcely any clothing, and this too, in an inclement season. And what rendered their condition still more wretched, they were kept on scanty allowance of provision. The English were also using every artifice in their power to induce the American soldiers to desert; promising them all the arrearages of pay due them by the American government, if they would only join the British standard; and, if they desired it, an exemption from military service. It is not strange, then, taking the misery and sufferings of the army into consideration, that both mutinies and desertions were frequent. But, notwithstanding all this, mark how prompt the American officers were in punishing disobedience of orders. In the year 1779, the whigs and tories had a severe and bloody conflict in South Carolina: the former were commanded by Col. Pickens, and the latter by Col. Boyd. The tories were defeated with great slaughter, and a number of them fell into the hands of the victors. Seventy of them were tried and condemned to death: the sentence, however, was not carried into effect upon more than eight or ten of them. The residue were pardoned, on condition of their joining the American standard. In the year 1780, Colonels Lacy, Campbell and Cleveland, with a body of American volunteers, attacked a strong force of British and tories, commanded by Col. Ferguson, on the top of King's mountain, near the confines of North and South Carolina. Col. F.'s force was defeated, with the loss of 225 in killed and wounded, and 800 prisoners. Ten tories who had surrendered, were immediately hanged by the conquerors. In the year 1781, a body of American light troops, under the command of Gen. Pickens and Col. Lee, had another most bloody engagement with about 350 tories in North Carolina, commanded by Col. Pyles. In this action the tories were completely beaten; and nearly the whole of their force was either killed or made prisoners. The conquerors on this occasion hung a great number of the most obnoxious among the vanquished.

While Gen Greene lay with his army in the neighborhood of Camden, South Carolina, in 1781, he ordered eight of his men hung in one day for desertion. This had a very salutary effect, and in a great measure prevented the evil practice for a length of time. In the same year, the British and Americans had an engagement at Guilford Court-house: Gen Stevens, the commander of the Virginia militia, posted forty riflemen at equal distances, about 20 paces in the rear of his militia brigade, with orders to shoot down every man who should leave his post. General Greene also pursued the same course with the militia in his southern campaign;† and in obedience to these orders, several of the deserting militia were put to instant death. A short time after the battle at Eutaw Springs, General Greene detected a conspiracy in his camp; and after making an investigation into the affair, twelve of the ringleaders were put to death. He took this step in order to ensure that subordination which is so essentially requisite for the government of an army. We might enumerate many other similar cases, but

we do not conceive it necessary. What we have already stated is amply sufficient to give coloring to the high-handed and malicious persecution which has been dealt out against Gen. Jackson, respecting the "six militiamen."

Before we proceed further, let us inquire who are they who have been so assiduously laboring to sear the laurels of our *Hickory?* Why, it is a knot of political intriguers who are daily lapping in the treasury porridge—fattening on the "wages of sin," and, Swiss-like, fighting the battles of those who pay them best. But what has been the result of the investigation instituted by this pensioned corps? Why, that in a military service of more than six years, Gen. Jackson has sanctioned the execution of only six men; and during this time he had under his command at different periods, more than thirty thousand men. We cannot but wonder that the number of executions should have been so small, when we take into consideration the numerous desertions and frequent mutinies with which he had to contend. But what were these six men executed for? Was it for desertion? No, Gen. Jackson never sanctioned the execution of a man for desertion only—these six men suffered for mutiny—mutiny of the most daring and outrageous nature; for menacing the lives of their officers—encouraging desertion—burning down the bake-house—shooting the beeves—breaking open the military chests—pillaging the public stores, and finally jeopardising the whole military establishment at Fort Jackson. Such were the crimes which these "wolves in sheep's clothing" expiated with their lives. One hundred and eighty men who deserted at the same time, were brought back and sentenced to have their wages stopped and heads shaved, as a punishment for their bad conduct; but Gen. Jackson promptly remitted the sentence. What a noble example! How benevolent and humane! Not willing to punish his fellow beings, (though richly merited,) further than the public good absolutely demanded. Now, we ask the candid to observe how prompt the officers of our revolutionary army were in punishing every breach of duty: let them also bear in mind the distress and poverty of that period, which would naturally incline soldiers to become restive. Then let them view the military life of Gen. Jackson, and see how completely all his steps are justified by examples which have been set by the purest patriots, whose conduct has never been called in question. We invite inquiry into this man's character—we challenge scrutiny—the more it is examined into, the more heart-rending will be the groans of the pensioned "Ebony" corps, and the more signal our "Hickory" triumph.

SPIRIT OF '76.

---

* For the truth of our statements, we refer the reader to Ramsey's History of the American Revolution.

† See the life of General Greene.

THE PRIVATE INTEGRITY OF MR. ADAMS.

If virtue be the vital principle of Republics—a proposition that cannot be reasonably doubted—we must contend that, he who can be convicted of any breach of honesty in transacting the ordinary business of life, is unworthy of employment in a public station. We do not admit that *all is fair in politics;* for we insist that private and public virtues have the same foundation; and that he who is dishonest in managing his own affairs, would not be honest in managing those of others. No prudent man would confide his pecuniary affairs to one whose integrity he doubted. He would find objections equally strong against confiding to the same man the trust of making or administering laws for his protection; for in point of importance, nothing can equal—much less exceed—the trust of making or administering the laws by which a free people govern themselves. Let the intelligent community apply these principles to JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, and then approve or condemn him, as they find he does or does not endure the trial.

In the year 1804, John Quincy Adams subscribed for ten shares in a Turnpike Corporation in Massachusetts; and when required by his associates in the undertaking to pay one thousand dollars, the amount of his subscription, HE REFUSED, *because of a legal defect in the instrument which he signed, whereby payment could not be enforced!!!*

The following is a statement of the case, and the opinion of the Court thereon:

"This was an action of the case in *assumpsit* brought against the defendant for not paying the amount of certain assessments for the expense of making the said turnpike road.

"The declaration contained six counts. The third was for 1500 dollars had and received by the defendant to the plaintiffs' use.----The sixth count was, 'for that the said *J. Q. A.* at *Plymouth* on the 30th day of March 1804, by a certain writing by him subscribed, commonly called a subscription paper, in consideration that the said corporation had permitted him to become associated with them, and interested in the funds to be raised for building their said turnpike road, and entitled to one-fiftieth part of all the income, profit and toll, that should arise and accrue to said corporation from the road, as well as from the corporate powers and franchise to them granted by said act of incorporation, promised said corporation to pay them ten shares or parts of five hundred of the whole expense they should incur in building said turnpike on demand: which said ten shares, the plaintiffs aver, amount to one-fiftieth part of the five hundred shares: and the plaintiffs further aver that the whole expense of building said road, and the bridges which make a part of said road, amounts to fifty thousand dollars, whereof the said ten shares or fiftieth part of the said *J. Q. A.* amounts to one thousand dollars, of which he has had notice, viz: on, &c. Yet though requested,' &c.

"The action was tried upon the general issue, pleaded to all the counts, before *Sedgwick, J.* at the sittings after the present term, and a verdict was found for the plaintiffs upon the two counts above recited, and the damages assessed at 1311 dollars: and upon the other counts for the defendant.

"The verdict was taken by consent, subject to the opinion of the court upon the report of the judge who sat in the trial, it being agreed that the verdict should be amended, or a gene-

al verdict entered for the defendant, as the opinion of the court should be.

"The judge reports that the general question at the trial depended on the construction of the paper writing above referred to, which was subscribed by the defendant and others, and was of the following tenor, *viz:*

"'We the subscribers, desirous to promote 'the building of a turnpike and bridges from '*New Bedford* to *Weymouth*, comprehended in 'a petition signed by *W. Roach*, jun. and oth-'ers, granted by the honorable legislature in 'their present session, have divided the expense 'of building said turnpike and bridges from '*Thompson's* pond in *Middleborough*, to commu-'nicate with the *Braintree* and *Weymouth* turn-'pike in the town of *Weymouth*, into 500 shares, 'and engage to take the number of shares af-'fixed to our names.----January 30, 1804.'

"The material allegations contained in the sixth count were proved, and it was also proved that the defendant subscribed the said paper after the passing of the act of incorporation by the legislature, and before any meeting of the persons incorporated and their associates.

"The principal question arising on the above-recited subscription paper was, whether the defendant was rendered by it liable to an action for the assessments made on the shares subscribed by him.

"After the verdict the cause was continued *nisi* for the consideration of the court, and being called up for argument at the following March term in *Suffolk*."

The court, after hearing counsel on both sides, gave their opinion as follows:

"The question in this case is, whether the defendant is liable to an action of *assumpsit* for neglecting to pay the sums assessed on the shares in the stock of the corporation, for which he became a subscriber. The answer to this inquiry must depend upon the construction of the writing which the defendant subscribed. Several cases of this kind have already been decided in this court; and each of them on the force and effect of the engagement entered into. The general principle, upon which they all rest is, that where the party makes an express promise to *pay* the assessments, he is answerable to the corporation upon such promise, and may be compelled to the performance of it by action at law. Where on the other hand one, by subscribing the act of association, simply engages to become a proprietor of a certain number of shares, without promising to pay assessments, there the only remedy which the corporation has, is by sale of the shares to raise the sum assessed on them.

"In the subscription paper in this case, the subscribers divide the expense into five hundred shares, and each engages to take the number of shares affixed to his name. In our opinion, this cannot amount to any thing more than an agreement into how many shares the stock shall be divided, and to whom those shares shall belong. There is no express promise to pay, nor is any language used, from which the law can raise an implied promise. It may be observed also, that this whole transaction passed before there had been any meeting of the corporation to authorize the receiving of subscriptions; and on this ground also, the paper cannot furnish evidence of a contract.

"On the whole it is our opinion that the plaintiffs have not maintained their action. The verdict must therefore be set aside, and pursuant to the agreement of the parties, a general verdict entered for the defendant."

The first question here presented is, whether John Quincy Adams, by subscribing the instrument above recited, *engaged* to take the number of shares therein affixed to his name? The second is, whether, in this engagement to take shares, he was understood by his associates as further engaging to pay for them? The third is, whether, if this engagement were defective in technical form, he acted with strict moral honesty in taking advantage of such defect to avoid the performance of it? The fourth is, whether, if he acted dishonestly in this, he is worthy of trust in any thing?

To them we answer, first; the engagement speaks for itself, and with sufficient perspicuity to shew the intent of the parties. They agreed to associate for the purpose of constructing a turnpike, and each one of them agreed to defray a certain portion of the expense. What, from reading this instrument, should we infer to have been their mutual understanding? That each one should pay a demand, without objection or cavil, such portion of the whole expense as should be assessed upon the number of shares for which he subscribed. Any man of common understanding would give it such construction, and any man of common honesty would feel bound to pay.

2d. Did Mr. Adams conduct with strict moral honesty, in availing himself of technical objections to avoid his engagements? The instrument was not, probably, drawn by a lawyer; for it wants that technical precision which would have been given to it by a correct and experienced jurist. It was probably drawn by some member of the association, perhaps a merchant, who understood his own views and those of his associates, and supposed that such views were expressed with sufficient perspicuity. His objection for want of form would have been anticipated; otherwise, they would have employed some careful and able conveyancer among the legal fraternity They thought, and very naturally, that, among an association who were supposed to act in good faith, they could express a simple agacement in plain english, without requiring a lawyer to fill twenty skins of parchment with technical nicities. But, it seems, Mr. Adams disappointed their expectations; for he refused to perform an obvious stipulation; to do what he knew, when signing the instrument, his associates expected of him; and because the contract, however just and equitable, could not be enforced in a court of law, on account of technical defects!!! Exemplary morality!! If a man should execute a deed to convey land, receive the purchase money, and then refuse to give possession, because the deed was not witnessed, he would be deemed a swindler. Yet, in some of the States, such defect would be a bar to an action against the vendor for possession of the land. If a man should promise to pay the debt of another, and afterwards refuse, because, after making the promise, he should be told that it was invalid, because not in writing, he would be accounted dishonest. Yet, the defence would be legal. Wherein does the moral conduct of Mr. Adams, in the

case of the turnpike, differ from that of the vendor of the land or the promissor, in the two cases last supposed? We should be obliged to Mr. Adams for furnishing a sound distinction.

If then, Mr. Adams will avail himself of an inequitable pretext for refusing to perform his engagements, is his morality of a standard sufficiently high? And if he would act dishonestly in *private* life, is he worthy of confidence in *public*, where the trusts are of higher and more important character?

MR. ADAMS' POLITICAL INTEGRITY.

Why did John Q. Adams turn Democrat?

We have given, in another place, some remarks on Mr. Adams' private integrity, which we now accompany with a letter from Governor Giles to the public in which, we understand him, to endorse the statement made by Mr. Randolph, two years past, in the Senate, that Mr. Adams had asserted to Mr. Giles that he had, during the summer previous to his *pretended* desertion of the federal party, discovered that the leaders of that party were engaged in a plan to dismember the Union, and were in a treasonable correspondence with the Governor of Canada, the purpose of which was to negotiate a secession of the New England states. Mr. Giles now says, that he did *then* believe that Mr. Adams told the truth, and was sincere in his professions of dislike to the federal party; but, if we understand him, he declares that he now believes that Mr. Adams deserted his party under false pretences.

There are some strong additional proofs which confirm Mr. Giles' opinion. We some time past published an extract from the Democratic Press, which, if true, and the Democratic Press is now said by the Adams men to be good authority, proves, beyond a doubt, the motives under which Mr. Adams deserted his party.

We are not left to wander through the mazes of conjecture to ascertain what were the inducements to Mr. John Adams to turn Democrat. In a letter to William Cunningham, dated Quincy, February 24th, 1824, the elder Adams said:

"Speaking of the classification of scholars in "our College before the Revolution, you con- "sider rank and wealth as anti republican "principles of precedence. Is this correct? "About forty years ago I was in company with "the oldest Colonel, John Chandler, of Wor- "cester, when a newspaper was brought in "containing an account of the last elections in "Rhode Island. All the principal Magistrates "were of ancient families. The old gentleman's "comment upon it was this: '*I have always "been of opinion that in popular governments the "people will always choose their officers from the "most ancient and respectable families.*' This has "been the case generally in Connecticut, as well "as Rhode Island, and in every Republican Go- "vernment, in Greece and Rome, and modern "Italy; in Switzerland and Genoa. The more "democratical the government, the more uni- "versal has been the practice. If a family, "which has been high in office and splendid "in wealth, falls into decay, from profligacy, "folly, vice or misfortune, they generally turn "democrats, and court the lowest of the peo- "ple with an ardor, an art, a skill, and conse- "quently, with a success which no vulgar de- "mocrat can attain."

On the 15th of March, 1804, he wrote to Mr. Cunningham as follows:

"You say the awful spirit of democracy is in "great progress: I BELIEVE IT, AND I KNOW "SOMETHING OF THE NATURE OF IT. It is a "young rake who thinks himself handsome and "well made, and who has little faith in virtue. "When the people once admit his courtship, "and permit him the least familiarity, they "soon find themselves in the condition of the "poor girl who told her own story in this af- "fecting style."

"Le Lendemain il sa da vantage:
"Il me promit Le Foi de marriage.
"Le Lendemain... il fut entrepant.
"Le Lendemain il me fit un enfant.'

"The next day he grew a little bolder—but "promised me marriage. The next day—he "began to be enterprising: But the next day "he got me with child.

"Democracy is Lovelace, and the people are "Clarissa. The artful villain will pursue the "innocent lovely girl to her ruin and death. "We know that some gentleman will arise at "last, who will put the guilty wretch to death "in a duel. *But this will be no friend of the la- "dy.* ☞ PERHAPS A SON, *a pupil, or a bosom "friend of Lovelace himself.*"

Such were the views of the elder Mr. Adams, upon which the plans for the elevation of his son were arranged. In the same letter, he says:

"Time would fail me to enumerate all the "Lovelaces in the United States. It would be "an amusing romance to compare their actions "and characters with his. *The federalists ap- "pear to me to be very inattentive to public events "as well as characters.*"

That there was a correspondent feeling and motive between the father and son appears by a comparison of dates and opinions.—Governor Giles dates the pretended apostacy of Mr. Adams in 1807. In another letter to Mr. Cunningham, dated Sept. 27th, 1808, the elder Adams said:

"As you have mentioned my son, I shall take "the liberty to say, tha this conduct, as far as "I know it, has been able, upright, candid, "impartial and independent. His letter to Mr. "Otis I applaud and admire. His resignation "I approve. He would have been more poli- "tic if he had declined his invitation to attend "the caucus, though the question was only "between Mr. Madison and Mr. Monroe, and "knowing both, I should certainly, as he did, "prefer the former to the latter."

Perhaps the sagacity of the old man saw in the election of Mr. Madison the "*safe precedent*" which was to elevate his son; for in the same paper he said:

"If I were only forty years old, I might have enthusiasm enough to hope that I would ride in the whirlwind."

And again, in another letter dated December

15th, 1808, after Mr. Adams had played the *part of Lovelace*, be said to Mr. Cunningham.

"Whatever friendship you may have retained "for John Quincy Adams or his father, I advise "you to conceal it close within your breast. "If it takes air, it will ruin your prospects."

* * * * * * * *

"I may mention to you, in confidence, that considerable pains have been taken to persuade your friend J. Q. Adams, to consent to be run (for Gov. of Massachusetts,) by the Republicans. But he is utterly averse to it, and so am I, for many reasons, among which are, 1st. The office, though a precious stone is but a carbuncle, shining in the dark. 2d. It is a state of perfect slavery. The drudgery of it is extremely oppressive. 3d. The compensation is not a living for a common gentleman. 4th. He must resign his professorship. 5th He must renounce his practice at the bar. 6th. He must stand in competition with Mr Lincoln, which would divide the republican interest, and certainly prevent the election of either. 7th. IT WOULD PRODUCE AN ETERNAL SEPARATION BETWEEN HIM AND THE FEDERALISTS, AT LEAST THAT PART OF THEM WHO NOW CONSTITUTE THE ABSOLUTE OLIGARCHY."

That the purpose of Mr. Adams, in turning Democrat, was to "court the people," appears from a further letter of the elder Adams, dated April 24th, 1809. He says:

"A new paper has been set up in Boston, "called the Boston Patriot, edited by Everett "and Monroe. Merely because the paper was "a novelty and the editors total strangers to "me, I have chosen it to convey some thoughts "to the public. *I* will either throw off that "intolerable load of obloquy and insolence "they have thrown upon me, or I will perish "in the struggle."

Again, June 7th, 1809:

"I will not die for nothing. My pen shall go "as long as my fingers can hold it.

"I should be glad to know if you read the "Patriot, &c."

Again, under date June 22d, 1809, he said:

"My daughter-in-law said, 'I know, Sir, "that your two sons are very much delighted "that you have taken the subject up.' This "I knew as well as she did."

Let the reader compare the dates of these letters with the substance, and he will find the key to unlock the secret motives that regulated all of Mr. Adams conduct. He will find the policy which induced him to bear false witness against the federal party, to insinuate himself into the republican ranks, and he will also learn the reason why Mr. A. has always been unwilling to do any act that would, as his father said in his letter of the 13th Dec., 1808: "*Produce an eternal separation between him and the federalists.*"

Mr. Adams, however, will give the best explanation of his own motives.

It is well known that the Democratic Press is now resorted to as the organ of the Coalition prints. The National Intelligencer has descended to vouchsafe for its credibility, and the National Journal is ready to certify to its statements. That paper, during the late canvass, was opposed to the election of Mr. Adams, and published the following:

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS' POLITICAL INTEGRITY.

"During the pendency of the last Presidential election, which resulted in an infamous intrigue and unprincipled *Coalition*, against the will and rights of the people, a writer in the American Statesman, printed in Mr. Adams' native State, Massachusetts, made, in an article signed "One of the People," a most serious charge against him. This charge was in the following terms:

"In the Spring of 1807 he presided at the Federal Caucus, which nominated," [CALEB STRONG, of BULWARK MEMORY,] for Governor, in opposition to the democratic candidate. About the same time, at the table of an illustrious citizen, now no more, he *lamented* the fearful progress of the democratic party, and of its principles, and declared that 'He had long meditated the subject, and had become convinced, that the only method by which the democratic party could be destroyed, was by joining with it, and urging it on with the utmost energy to the completion of its views, when by the result would prove so ridiculous and so ruinous to the country, that the people would be led to despise the principles and to condemn the effects of democratic policy, and then,' said he, '*we may have a form of government better suited to the genius and disposition of our country, than the present constitution.*"

'Some of the guests who heard that declaration, and have frequently repeated it, are still living. Let the *kennel* presses, therefore, take care how they deny its authority.'

This charge having been made, the *National Journal*, as it was generally understood, edited by Mr. ADAMS, at that time, and then just established to electioneer for him, attempted a denial; but, in what manner was this attempt made? It was not done with the frankness of honesty and the boldness of innocence. It was not denied that witnesses could be produced to prove this charge against Mr. Adams. But a feeble, impotent attempt, *by way of laying an anchor to windward*, and denoting the *consciousness of guilt*, was made to argue against its probability. However, the Statesman and the other papers who had repeated this charge, were called upon for their authority, *about the time that the battle was over.* Horatio Townsend, Esq. a gentleman of character, the Clerk of the Judicial Court of the State, for the county of Norfolk, and the *neighbor* and *friend of Mr. Adams*, was named as one, who had heard these declarations, and had *often recited them.* It was also stated by the Editors of the Statesman, that *they had been informed*, that these declarations were made at the table of the late Chief Justice Parsons, then the great leader of the Federal party in Massachusetts. What was the next step to this business? Mr. Townsend was a friend of Mr. Adams, disposed to do every thing, which, *in conscience*, he could do, to help his cause, and he gives his certificate or affidavit, which was published in vindication of Mr. Adams' innocence. Here it is:

"NORFOLK, ss.

"DEDHAM, November 6th, 1824.

"I, Horatio Townsend, Clerk of the Supreme Judicial Courts and of the Court of Common

Pleas, &c. for this county, having this day heard read to me, the article in the American Statesman and City Register of this date, headed "Explanatory," hereby make solemn oath, that I have no *recollection* of ever having dined at the table of the Honorable Theophilus Parsons, in company with Mr. John Quincy Adams, nor do I believe that I ever did, nor do *I recollect* or believe, that I ever met Mr. Adams in company with the late Chief Justice Parsons at any time subsequent to my leaving Mr. Parsons' office, as a student, in the Spring of 1783.

HORATIO TOWNSEND."

Now, in the name of common sense, what does this testimony of Mr. Adams' *own witness* amount to? Does he deny that he *ever heard* his friend, Mr. Adams, make *these declarations? No.* He makes no such denial; but contents himself merely with saying that he does not *recollect* dining at Judge Parsons' table with Mr. Adams, or meeting Mr. Adams in company with Judge Parsons for a long period of time. This is the head and front of this affidavit; and, make the most of it, it only renders it *a little uncertain* whether *these declarations* were made at the table of *Judge Parsons*, or that of *some other* Federal leader, with whom Mr. Adams was *at that time in close communion*, conspiring the destruction of the Republican cause. If Mr. Townsend, who was *so ready* to give this affidavit, on *the very day* that he *first learned* that he was named as a witness to *these declarations*, could, consistently with *truth*, have denied that he heard Mr. Adams make *them*, would he not have done so? Every man of common sense answers this question. John B. Derby, Esq., a Counsellor at Law of Norfolk, and son-in-law of Mr. Townsend, and the Hon. James Richardson, a Counseller at Law of that County, also gave the following affidavit and certificate, which were published:

AFFIDAVIT.

"I, John B. Derby, of Dedham, late of Medfield, in the county of Norfolk, of lawful age, testify and say, that one evening in the Summer of 1820, being at the house of Horatio Townsend, Esq. of Dedham, conversing with said Townsend on the political character of John Quincy Adams, and objecting to Mr. Adams on the ground of his desertion of Federal principles, said Townsend asserted, that *Mr. Adams was in heart a Federalist*, although *acting with the Democratic party*, and for proof thereof stated, that he, Mr. Townsend, being many years before in company with Mr. Adams and other distinguished Federalists, previous to Mr. Adams' political conversion, I think at the late Chief Justice Parsons, Mr. Adams speaking of the increasing power of the Democratic party, used in substance, the expressions attributed to him by the author of "One of the People," published in the Statesman of July last. Afterwards, in the spring I think, of 1822, the said Townsend being at my house, in Medfield, on my again introducing the discussion of the same subject, repeated to me the same declarations of Mr. Adams, in similar language. That John Quincy Adams made such observations, I do not *know*, but I was constrained to *believe that he made them*, by the frequent and confident assertions of Mr. Townsend. That Mr. Townsend said in substance what I have here stated, is confirmed by the Hon. James Richardson, who says, that on hearing the extract from "One of the People" read to him, he immediately recollected having heard Mr. Townsend so express himself in conversation, once at said Townsend's house, and also at his office, and that it occurred to him before he [Mr. R.] knew that he was designated as one of those to whom the above statements of Mr. Townsend were addressed.

JOHN B. DERBY."

The pieces signed "One of the People," are written with so much talent, it is hardly necessary for me to add, I am not the author.

"NORFOLK, ss. Nov. 8, 1824.

"Then the above named John B. Derby declared, on oath, that the above statement, subscribed by him, was true.

ERASMUS WORTHINGTON,
Justice of the Peace."

On the back of the affidavit is the following certificate.

"DEDHAM, Nov. 8th, 1824.

"I have read the part of the within affidavit which relates to myself, and declare it to be substantially correct.

JAMES RICHARDSON."

This is the evidence, and in the court of common sense, where the people are the judges, its effect is irresistible. If it needed confirmation, it may be found in John Quincy Adams' Inaugural Speech, where he covertly denounced the Democratic party, and its ties, and its *badge*, his appointment of Rufus King, a minister of his father in the reign of terror, to the Court of St. James, in his speedy relapse to his *early faith*, the most dangerous doctrines of the Federal party, in Josiah Quincy's exulting toast, at a feast in honor of his *shameful elevation* to the Presidency, against the will of the people—"THE POLITICAL REGENERATION, *those who felt with the first Adams, rise with the second,*" and Mr. Adams' speech a *few days* since in Faneuil Hall, in Boston. In that speech, Mr. Adams pronounced this same Josiah Quincy, who moved without a single vote to support his own, the impeachment of Thomas Jefferson; who threatened on the floor of the House of Representatives, that New England must have her way, *peaceably if she could, forcibly if she must;* who was the author of the infamous resolution of the Senate of Massachusetts, lately expunged from the records as a disgrace to the State, that *it was unbecoming a moral and religioue people to rejoice in our glorious victories during the late war;* who, three years since, in the same place, the cradle of liberty, at a public meeting, to aid the election of the *Hartford Convention candidate*, for Governor, declared the Democratic party to be "THE SCUM OF THE POT;" *to be the worthy representative* of the Josiah Quincy, of the Revolution. SO MUCH FOR JOHN QUINCY ADAMS' POLITICAL INTEGRITY.

GOV. GILES TO THE PUBLIC.

In regard to Mr. Adams—

1st. I believe Mr. Adams not to be a republican, either in principle or practice. I believe he is not attached to the written constitution of his country; but prefers a government founded

upon the unlimited will of the governors. I believe that he claims and exercises powers for the General Government, derived from sources paramount the Constitution; and that, even in his interpretation of the Constitution itself, he renders all its restraining provisions inoperative and unavailing. These restraining provisions, I believe, afford the only security to the American people against the usurpations of the General Government. Mr. Adams having placed himself above those constitutional restraints, I consider him a civil usurper; and that "in the present party politics," these doctrines are "so frightful on the part of the administration," as to justify a change under any circumstances. The gain may consist in the preservation of our present written constitution, instead of the substitution of a government of unlimited powers. Is it possible that there could be a greater gain? Is not this consideration of itself of sufficient magnitude to outweigh all countervailing considerations? Acting under these convictions, I presume that a majority of "the Anti-Jackson Convention," and the chairman amongst them, would prefer a change, even in favor of Gen. Jackson, provided they also believed of him as I do—that he would cause the government to be administered, as far as he could, upon a fair, candid, and correct interpretation of the written constitution. I cannot concur in the wisdom recommended by "the Anti-Jackson Convention," of taking sanctuary in the arms of a cool, deliberate, systematic civil usurper, as a protection against the fears of a Military Chieftain—when, too, this terrific Military Chieftain turns out, upon examination, to be an ideal vision—a miserable, delusive ignis fatuus—the unsubstantial spectre of frightened imaginations—an unreal ghost, raw-head-and-bloody-bones, conjured up by the friends of unlimited government, to frighten timid and unthinking republicans.

2d. I believe Mr. Adams does not possess the necessary useful practical talents for administering any government whatever; and that Gen. Jackson's talents for that object are incomparably greater than Mr. Adams'—whilst I am willing to admit, that Mr. Adams may be more than General Jackson the poet *born*, and more the scholar *made*. I believe Mr. Adams not to be a wise man; that he possesses very few of the attributes of wisdom. I must stick to my definition of terms. I believe Mr. Adams is not wise in conduct—not wise in actions. I believe he is not blessed with the happy talent of choosing the best measures, nor the best means of carrying his chosen measures into effect.

To be in the fashion, particularly with "the Anti-Jackson convention," I must coin a word to convey my ideas of Mr. Adams in this respect,—I believe Mr. Adams to be an anti-wise man. The whole history of his political life will prove the correctness of these convictions: but I will specify a few cases only in demonstration. His letter to the committee before quoted, grounded, I think, upon fallacious misrepresentations, extending even to a point of incredibility—His various efforts in various papers, but particularly in his first message to Congress, to derive powers to the general government from sources paramount the constitution, or from his own peculiarly eccentric interpretation of the constitution—His conduct in the whole of his intercourse with Great Britain, by which we have not only lost the West India trade, but diminished the rest of our British trade, and hazarded the whole—a trade amounting to more than one half of our Foreign trade, and thus introducing a state of impoverishment in the United States, unknown heretofore. I think Mr. Adams has been particularly anti-wise in all his most important diplomatic negotiations; particularly so in his treaties of limits, both with Spain and Great Britain.—In the one, he lost the Texas: in the other, he has reduced us to the disgraceful arbitament of a foreign power, for a territory on our North-Eastern boundary, equal, perhaps greater, in extent, than the whole State of New Hampshire. I conceive Mr. Adams particularly anti-wise, in his claims to Executive powers, especially in relation to his competency to originate foreign missions without the consent of the Senate; particularly so, when that question was settled in his own person against such right, about the close of Mr. Jefferson's administration. Without impugning, at this time, the policy of his Panama Mission, I think one of the reasons he assigned for it, the most anti-wise that could have entered into the imagination of man—to liberalize the South American Catholic, on the score of religion. This most eccentric notion has perhaps, tended, more than any thing else, to deprive us of the valuable favor of the South American Republics This catalogue of anti-wise measures must suffice, although it is but just begun.

3d. I have no confidence in Mr. Adams' political integrity nor candor. I believe him to be neither an honest nor incorruptible politician. Although many instances might be given of this great and inexcusable defect in Mr. Adams' political character, I will here mention only two: The first shall be taken from his reply to to the committee appointed to inform him of his election to the Presidency. According to my invariable habit in stating facts, when practicable, in the words of the writer, I give them here in Mr. Adams' own words:

Extract from Mr. Adams' reply to the Committee appointed to inform him of his election.

"It has been my fortune to be placed by the division of sentiment prevailing among our countrymen, on this occasion, in competition friendly and honorable with three of my fellow citizens, all justly enjoying, in eminent *degrees* the public favor, and of whose worth, talents and services, no one entertains a higher and more respectful sense than myself. The names of two of them were, in the fulfilment of the provisions of the constitution, presented to the selection of the House, in concurrence with my own; names closely associated with the glory of the nation; and one of them farther recommended by a larger minority of the primary electoral suffrages than mine.

"In this state of things, could my refusal to accept the trust thus delegated to me, give an immediate opportunity to the people to form and to express, with a nearer approach to unanimity, the object of their preference, *I should not hesitate to decline the acceptance of this eminent charge, and to submit the decision of this*

But the Constitution itself has not so disposed of the contingency, which would arise in the event of the refusal; I shall, therefore, repair to the post assigned me by the call of my country, signified through her constitutional organs," &c.

Here, Mr. Adams positively and unequivocally asserts, in substance, that in consequence of all his predecessors in the high station to which the selection of the house had called him, having had a majority of the votes of the primary electoral suffrages, whilst it had fallen to his lot to have a minority of votes; and still worse, one of his competitors for the office having even a greater minority than himself—*he should not hesitate to decline the acceptance of the eminent charge, and to submit the decision of this momentous question again to the determination of the people, provided his refusal to accept the trust delegated to him, would give an immediate opportunity to the people to form, and to express, with a nearer approach to unanimity, the object of their preference.* I put it to the anti-Jackson Convention in candor and in honor to say, whether this solemn declaration, taking into consideration, the circumstances under which it was made, is not absolutely incredible? Whether they do believe it? If they do not believe it, can any one of those high-minded honorable gentlemen, reconcile it to himself, to vote for any human being for his President, who is capable of making a cool, deliberate misrepresentation of his views to the whole American people upon the most solemn occasion? Suppose all the American people were called upon to give their votes for the next president upon the consideration of this question alone: Do you conscientiously believe this solemn declaration, made to you by Mr. Adams? to wit: That he was desirous of submitting his election again to the people? How many votes would he get in the United States? Let every one answer this question for himself. It is not possible to conceive, that many could be brought to vote for one for their President, under the firm conviction, that such one had deliberately misrepresented his own views to them on a most solemn occasion? I, for one, must beg to be incredulous upon this occasion—and I, for one, will not vote for Mr. Adams. Under what circumstances, too, was this solemn declaration made? At a moment when Mr. Adams was making overtures, as is asserted, to the Federalists for their votes, to make him President. I say nothing about his understanding with Mr. Clay—notwithstanding Mr. Clay's uncontradicted declaration, that he knew Mr. Adams' opinions upon the Pennsylvania policy, in time to make it a reason with him for voting for Mr. Adams. That point will be undisturbed here, because it is disputed;—whilst Mr. A.'s overture to the Federalists, thro' Mr. Webster, stands yet uncontradicted by Mr. W. as far as I know. I therefore take that fact for granted, and it is impossible to conceive, that at the same moment Mr. Adams was stooping to intrigue with the Federalists for the Presidential office, (per fas aut nefas,) he would not hesitate to call for another election from the people, especially when there was every reason to believe, in that case, he would not be elected. Now, let us see the relations in which Mr. Adams stood to this same Federal party, at the moment of making this overture. It is known, and universally admitted, that, during the session of Congress of 1807, 1808, Mr. Adams, most unexpectedly, but avowedly, made a complete political somerset from the Federal to the Republican party. At that time, the canvass for the Presidential election was actually cast; and no federal candidate was offered. The contest was settled down between Mr. Madison and Governor Clinton. Mr Adams therefore found himself cut off from all hope of personal aggrandizement from his old friends, the federalists, for eight years at least—and, in all probability, for ever; certainly under their old designation of Federal party. It was at this moment, eventually, so auspicious to his hopes of personal aggrandizement, that this somerset was most adroitly performed. How was this done? It was first done by a most solemn communication to myself, and afterwards to Mr. Jefferson, as I am well informed. Previously to this time, Mr. A.'s conduct towards Mr. Jefferson had been such as to prevent the annunciation to him, in the first instance of his intended desertion from the Federal party; and this is, probably the true cause of his devolving the disclosure upon me. This disclosure was first made, during the session of Congress, commencing 26th October, 1807. During the next session, it became my duty in consequence thereof, to defend Mr. Adams, against several violent attacks made upon him, on account of his wonderful political somerset, by Mr. Pickering, his former colleague in the Senate. In 1808, I disclosed as much of Mr. Adams' communication to me as I thought was then required to justify his conduct against Mr. Pickering's attacks. The following is an extract taken from a speech delivered in the Senate on the 2d December, 1818, which leaves no possible doubt of the fact, that, during the preceding session, Mr. Adams did make a most solemn communication to me, of his intended desertion from the Federal party.

Extract from Speech.

"I had hoped, Mr. President, that the gentleman (Mr. Pickering) would have so far restrained his feelings as to have permitted, this gentleman's retirement, (Mr. Adams) to have shielded him from these unmerited reproaches; but it seems that no delicacy of situation can procure an exemption from the inveteracy of the gentleman's passions. This cruel attack has imposed upon me an indispensable obligation to defend this absent gentleman; and it has been principally this circumstance, which has driven me again, most reluctantly, into this debate. Sir, I can attest, and now do attest with great pleasure, the disinterestedness and purity of the motives which dictated that gentleman's (Mr. Adams') late political conduct. As to its wisdom, that is a matter of opinion, and now in a course of experiment; but as to his exemption from all views of personal promotion, or aggrandizement, *I here assert that fact upon my own knowledge and upon my own responsibility, as far as can be warranted by the most explicit and unequivocal assurances from the gentleman himself; given, too, under circumstances which render their sincerity unquestionable.*" Every impartial, intelligent man must see at the first blush, that Mr. Adams' communication must have been made to me in the most solemn and

impressive manner, to justify this positive pledge on my part, in behalf of Mr. Adams, grounded upon his own most explicit and unequivocal assurances; given, too, under circumstances which render their sincerity unquestionable.

At the time Mr. Adams made the disclosure to me, he imposed no injunction of secrecy whatever. He spoke of the occasion, however, as one of awful magnitude Nothing less than hazarding the severance of the Union. The course of conduct which I have heretofore pursued respecting it, was dictated solely by my views of the character of the communication. In 1808. I disclosed as much as I thought the then occasion called for. I did not think proper then to disclose more; but I do not now, nor did I ever think, that any obligation whatever was imposed upon me, growing out of the peculiar character of the disclosure, not to make it known, under extraordinary contingencies, which might occur. I think, too, that wonderful events arising from that eventful transaction, have since occurred, which would justify such disclosure; but I have at all times preferred, as I now prefer, that Mr. Adams should make the disclosure himself I have three times, heretofore, publicly called on Mr. Adams to make the disclosure himself. These calls did appear in the Richmond Enquirer, January 7th, February 14th and March 17th, 1816.

But since the publication of Mr. Jefferson's letter addressed to me, dated 20th December, 1825---this subject is reduced within a very narrow compass.---By comparing the statement made in my speech just quoted, with Mr. Jefferson's letter, and marking the proper deductions from them, taken in context with each other, very few points respecting that most eventful transaction will require to be disclosed, so as to give the public a fair view of the whole ground, and thus enable the people to form a just estimate of Mr. Adams' object for his pretended political conversion; and to stamp the true character upon this wonderful transaction. In my speech delivered in the Senate, 2d December, 1808, I assert, "but as to his (Mr. Adams) exemption from all views of personal promotion, or aggrandizement.---I here assert that fact upon my own knowledge, and upon my own responsibility----*as far as can be warranted by the most explicit and unequivocal assurances from the gentleman himself; given, too, under circumstances, which render their sincerity unquestionable.*" Mr. Adams having approved, and, indeed, having been highly gratified with the defence made for him, at the time, as I have been often informed, cannot now deny the fact of his having made this communication to me; nor the solemn and imposing circumstances under which it was made. Since that time, in consequence of a call from me upon Mr. Jefferson, for his recollection of the transaction, and for his views of the propriety of giving it publicity under existing circumstances, I received rom Mr. Jefferson the following statement.

"You ask my opinions of the propriety of giving publicity to what is stated in your letter, as having passed between Mr John Q. Adams, and yourself.—Of this, no one can judge but yourself. It is one of those questions which belong to the forum of feeling. This alone can decide on the degree of confidence implied in the disclosure. Whether under no circumstances, it was to be communicable to others. It does not seem to be of that character or at all to wear that aspect. They are historical facts, which belong to the present as well as future times. I doubt, whether a single fact known to the world, will carry as clear a conviction to it, of the correctness of *our knowledge of the treasonable views of the federal party of that* day as that, disclosed by *this* most nefarious and daring *attempt to dissever the Union*, of which the Hartford Convention was a subsequent chapter, and both of these having failed, consolidation becomes the first book of their history." Mr. Jefferson here states;—"I doubt whether a single fact known to the world, will carry as clear a conviction to it, of the correctness of our knowledge of *treasonable views* of the federal party *of that day* (1807,) as that disclosed by *this*, (disclosure made by Mr. Adams of that day—1807,) most nefarious and daring *attempt to dissever the Union*—of which the Hartford Convention, (1814,) was the subsequent chapter." Hence the following facts evidently appear: That Mr. Adams made the disclosure to me, of his intending to desert the Federal party the winter of 1807, 1808—to the best of my recollection, it was a short time previous to the first embargo. That it was made under the most solemn assurances of his patriotism and disinterestedness, and of an entire exemption from all views of personal promotion by the party, to which he had proselyted. Mr. Jefferson states the grounds of this charge, as communicated by Mr. Adams himself to be, *the treasonable views* of the federal party, *and that these treasonable views extended to disunion.* All that now remains to be disclosed to the public, to give a full view of the whole ground of this eventful transaction is, to designate the particular conspiracy on the part of the federalists of that day, 1807, which did induce Mr. Adams to charge them, according to Mr. Jefferson's statement, with treasonable views to dissever the Union; the particular foreign agents with whom it was carried on, the particular circumstances, which gave rise to it, and the particular portions of the federalists implicated in the treasonable negotiations then on foot.—Mr. Adams can state these facts to the public if he should think proper to do so; or if, which I suppose impossible, he should deny them; then ought he to tell, what other political sins the federal party had committed in so henious a character as to justify his open, formal and sudden abandonment of them in their utmost need; and his adhesion to their opponents—indeed, in the true spirit of proselyteism, his going to the uttermost extremes in supporting his newly chosen associates, and his fulsome flatteries of Mr. Jefferson, through his extravagant commendation of this measure, and that too, not long after he had heaped upon Mr. Jefferson, all kinds of abuse, and even called doggrel verse, as is said, to his aid for the purpose. Now, suppose it should turn out, that no such conspiracy did exist, and that no such treasonable negotiations were carrying on, nor such treasonable views were entertained by the federalists at that time, 1807—What must the world think of such treacherous charges against his old friends for his own personal promotion and aggrandizement, as is now rendered evident, directly against his own solemn avowals a-

the time?—However deluded at the time by Mr. Adams' solemn asseverations—and I acknowledge I was deluded into a perfect confidence in his disclosures—I now sincerely believe, that the whole of these charges against the federalists were unfounded, and consisted only in Mr. Adams' own mental misgivings and poetic licences. For me, this conviction is sufficient; and I shall not vote for Mr. Adams for my President. Others, of course, will also act as they think best.

4th. I do not believe Mr. Adams to be a patriot, nor a hero. His whole political history proves that he has at all times advanced his own personal aggrandizement and pecuniary emoluments at the expense of his country—so much so, that he has raised his own fortune and his own greatness, first upon his own party's, and then upon his country's ruin. His heroism is truly sui generis. I do not know of his ever having made but one attempt to display his courage. That was done during his most unaccountable electioneering visit to Baltimore. It appeared in the form of a toast with an explanation—"Ebony and Topaz," implying his triumphant joy at the militia-man's bullet being sped to General Ross's heart!!! O! miserable puer!! In this wonderful display of heroism, Mr. Adams' courage did not begin to crow until thirteen years after the battle was ended; and then, indeed, it triumphantly crowed over the hallowed dust of a gallant fallen foe: slain by the hands of another, whose courage loudest crowed in the battle's front. So, Gen. Jackson's courage always loudest crows in the battle's front. Yes, in the face and eyes of his gallant, hostile, embattled combatants. I would vote against Mr. Adams for this anti-wise, unfeeling act alone; revolting, as I think, to every honorable sentiment of the human heart; proving at once Mr. Adams' own destitution of refined sensibilities, and an utter ignorance of the true impulses of human nature. It casts a stain over the generous sensibilities of the American nation, so far as its character is associated with the character of its Chief Magistrate. If tended still farther to irritate the patriotic feelings of a gallant foreign nation, too much irritated before, by wanton provocations in his anti-wise diplomatic negotiations; and at the same time, could not avoid inflicting a wanton cruel wound upon the feelings of an amiable bereaved family. It would require strong countervailing considerations to induce me to overlook this single inexcusable act of Mr. Adams; and I know not of one single countervailing consideration in his favor.

5th. I do not believe Mr. Adams to be a military chieftain. No: nor a citizen soldier—and since the Anti-Jackson Conventionists seem to plume themselves upon Mr. Adams' destitution of all military pretensions—military principle—military skill, and military prowess, I am willing to allow to them the whole; and yet, I think, Mr. Adams will not make the better President, in consequence of this boasted destitution. Will he, thereby, be better qualified to discharge the high constitutional *military duties* of the President? Most assuredly, I think not. In relation to the discharge of the high military functions of the President, Gen. Jackson certainly is greatly to be preferred.

Whether, therefore, in regard to the dis-

President, I think Gen. Jackson incomparably preferable to Mr. Adams, as President of the United States. Upon these reasons chiefly, although many others might be added, I place myself in voting for Gen. Jackson, in preference to Mr. Adams; and I know, that I stand perfectly justified to my own conscience, for doing so; and I trust, to my God and my country.

WM. B. GILES.

Feb. 28, 1828.

Note.—"To liberalize the South American Catholics, on the scale of religion." A rumor is afloat, that in the late negotiation between the U. States and Sweden, our negotiator was instructed to make a formal demand of the Swedish negotiator, that the heading of our former treaties with Sweden should be changed. The treaties heretofore ran, in substance, "In the name of the Holy and undivided Trinity." Our minister, it is now said, was instructed to have those words stricken out. This demand, if made, would have the effect of converting a ceremony into a principle—It was upon that ground rejected, perhaps laughed at, by the Swedish minister. The Senate can tell. Ought not the people to know it? If the rumor be true, is not this an anti-wise diplomacy? Could Mr. Adams' Unitarian creed have dictated this instruction?

PROPOSALS

For publishing once a week, from the 1st of March to the 15th of October,

FOR ONE DOLLAR,

The United States' Telegraph---Extra.

ANDREW JACKSON is *the candidate of the People.* But union and concert of action are necessary to success. The organized efforts of the administration are fitted for effect, and vigorous exertions are required to counteract them. In aid of such exertions, the undersigned have been advised to issue a WEEKLY PAPER, on terms that will enable them merely to defray the expense of publication. Located at the Seat of Government, having access to the public libraries, and the command of official documents, possessing already a large share of public confidence, and the advantages of a central position and extensive correspondence, they may aver that, in issuing such publication, they can aid, in some degree, the great cause of truth and the PEOPLE.

If numerous individuals throughout the country, and the corresponding committees in the several States, counties, and townships of the Union, should unite in giving it circulation, the undersigned will be more than compensated for the labor that will devolve on them, by the facility which it will afford for disseminating truth among the people

They therefore propose to publish THE UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH EXTRA, weekly, until the 15th of October next, for ONE DOLLAR, payable, in *all cases*, in advance. *This paper will be devoted exclusively to* the Presidential election, and will contain official documents, and such essays, original and selected, as, in the judgment of the Editors will most promote the election of the Democratic Republican Candidates, ANDREW JACKSON and JOHN C. CALHOUN.

DUFF GREEN,
RUSSELL JARVIS.

UNITED STATES TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*,

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, MARCH 28, 1828. No. 3.

A LETTER

From the Jackson Committee at Nashville, in answer to one from a similar Committee, at Cincinnati, upon the subject of Gen. Jackson's marriage, accompanied by documents in an appendix thereto annexed.

To Elijah Hayward, Moses Dawson, Thomas Henderson, James N. Miller, Thomas Smith, and Arthur Henrie, Committee of Correspondence, on behalf of the Cincinnati Jackson Committee.

Gentlemen: In reply to your note published in the Nashville Republican, under date May 12th, 1827, calling our attention to certain newspaper charges against General Jackson and his lady, and particularly the charge made in one newspaper of Cincinnati, that, "in the summer of 1790, General Jackson prevailed upon the wife of Lewis Robards, of Mercer County, Kentucky, *to desert* her husband and live with himself in the character of a wife;" and having also seen the evidence by which the editor attempts to support this charge, we now submit to you a succinct statement of the facts attending the separation of L[illegible] and the subsequent marriage of Mrs. [illegible] Jackson, and also such evidence and documents as will probably be sufficiently satisfactory to the public.

Before we proceed, it may be proper to know something of the persons whose testimony is subjoined, alluded to, or quoted.

The character of Gen. James Breck[illegible]ge, of Fincastle, Va. is, no [illegible] you; it is said to be high and unspotted, [illegible] was a member of the Virginia Legislature when Capt. Robards applied for a divorce, and one of the committee appointed to examine his application, and report a bill, as stated in the Cincinnati paper. (*a.*)

Judge McNairy, whose letter is subjoined, is the district judge of the Federal Court, a man of high and unblemished reputation, whose statements may be relied on as most accurate and incontrovertible. Those who know him know that no considerations could induce him to give the slightest coloring to any part of his testimony. (*b.*)

Mrs Elizabeth Craighead is the widow of the late Rev. Thomas B. Craighead, and sister to James Brown, our present [illegible] a lady of the purest character, wi[illegible] highly intelligent and cultivated. (*c.*)

Mrs. Sally Smith, widow of General Daniel Smith, formerly a Senator in Congress, a lady of unblemished character, and of excellent good sense. (*c.*)

Mrs. Mary H. Bowen, widow of Capt. William Bowen, sister of Gen. Russell and the late Col. Russell, of Fayette county, Ky., a most respectable and sensible lady. (*e.*)

Mr. Thomas Crutcher, the Treasurer of West Tennessee, whose character for honesty and veracity is as high and unquestioned as that of any man in the State. (*g.*)

Of Mr. A. Foster, it is only necessary to say, that he was for many years President of the Board of our Land Commissioners, one of the most honorable and correct men of our country. (*m.*)

Of Judge Overton's character we need say nothing; the testimony of no person has been resorted to where there could be any, the slightest, question raised as to their characters.

In making the investigation you wished, we have met with some difficulty and delay on account of the great length of time since the facts occurred, and that the public mind, for a great many years, in this country, had ceased to think on this subject. At the time when Mr. Robards separated from his wife, applied for a divorce, obtained it, and General Jackson married her, when all the facts were fresh and distinct, public opinion was formed, and the cotemporaneous judgment of the society in which those [illegible] decisive [illegible] an injurious suspicion w[illegible] to the previous conduct; to the justice of this judgment, thirty-seven years of domestic peace and useful virtue, have given a sanction which must operate upon every candid and generous mind, with irresistible power. But, notwithstanding all these difficulties, we believe that we are able to present to you a correct history of those transactions.

In the [illegible] of 1788, Mrs. Robards was compelled [illegible] husband, Capt. Robards, who then resided [illegible] county, Ky. to leave him, and to seek a home with her mother, Mrs. Donelson, a widow lady, living about ten miles from Nashville, in Tennessee. That Mrs Robards was *compelled* at this time by her husband to leave him, is proven by Judge Overton's testimony, by Gen. Ray and by Mr. John MacGinnis; that she was an injured and innocent woman, of most irreproachable character and conduct, is proven by the same persons, and by Maj. Thos. Allen and Capt. John Meaux; (*i.*) Capt. Robards himself acquits her, and admitted that his suspicions were unjust. (*j.*)

In the [illegible] summer of 1789, Judge Overton and Gen. Jackson [illegible] Robards in the same spring or summer, Capt. Robards and his wife became reconciled, and lived together at her mother's, Mrs. Donelson. (*k.*)

---

a Appendix, no. 1. b no. 2. d no. 3. e no. 4. g Appendix, no. 5. g no. 6. m no. 12. i nos. 13, 8, 9, [illegible] 11. j nos. [illegible] 13. k nos. 6, 1, 5, [illegible]

In the summer or fall of this year, Capt. Robards became jealous of Gen. Jackson; upon this part of the subject we will quote the statement of Judge Overton as giving the most authentic account of the several facts which transpired about that time. He says, "not many months elapsed before Robards became jealous of Jackson, which I felt confident was without the least ground. Some of his irritating conversation on this subject with his wife, I heard amidst the tears of herself and her mother, who were greatly distressed. I urged to Robards the unmanliness of his conduct, after the pains I had taken to produce harmony, as a mutual friend of both families, and my honest conviction that his suspicions were groundless. These remonstrances seemed not to have the desired effect; as much commotion and unhappiness prevailed in the family, as in that of Mrs. Robards in Kentucky. At length I communicated to Jackson the unpleasant situation of living in a family where there was so much disturbance, and concluded by telling him that we would endeavor to get some other place; to this he readily assented, but where to go we did not know. Being conscious of his innocence, he said that he would talk to Robards. What passed between Capt. Robards and Jackson I do not know, as I was absent somewhere, not now recollected, when the conversation and results took place, but returned soon afterwards. The whole affair was related to me by Mrs. Donelson, (the mother of Mrs. Robards,) and as well as I recollect, by Jackson himself. The substance of their account was, that Mr. Jackson met Captain Robards near the orchard-fence, and began mildly to remonstrate with him respecting the injustice he had done his wife as well as himself. In a little time Robards became violently angry and abusive, and threatened to whip Jackson, made a show of doing so, &c. Jackson told him he had not bodily strength to fight him, nor should he do so, feeling conscious of his innocence, and returned to his cabin, telling him, at the same time, that if he insisted on fighting, he would give him gentlemanly satisfaction, or words to that effect. Upon Jackson's return out of the house, Capt Robards said that he did not care for him nor his wife, abusing them both—that he was determined not to live with Mrs. Robards. Jackson retired from the family, and went to live at Mansker's station. Capt. Robards remained several months with his wife, and then went to Kentucky, in company with Mr. Thomas Crutcher, and probably some other persons."

So far as we have been able to ascertain by inquiry, this is the only altercation that ever took place between Gen. Jackson and Capt. Robards: Mr. Crutcher says, "I never heard of Gen. Jackson and Capt. Robards having any quarrel or misunderstanding but the one, nor do I believe they ever did." *(e)*

This difference or quarrel was in assertion of the injustice, (as declared by Gen. Jackson,) of Capt. Robards' suspicions against him: Gen. Jackson seems immediately to have left Mrs. Donelson's. Capt. Robards and his wife lived together several months afterwards in apparent harmony. *(m)*

In the month of May or June, 1790, Captain Robards left Mrs. Donelson's to go to Kentucky in company with Mr. Thomas Crutcher, with the *avowed* intention of returning and settling in Mrs. Donelson's neighborhood, which had been made one of the terms of reconciliation by Mrs. R., though *really* his determination appears to have been never to return or live with his wife again, but to desert her for ever; *(n)* and in fact never did return or see her again. For this part of the testimony, we refer you to Mr. Crutcher's statement

Mrs. Robards lived at her mother's during the whole of the summer and fall of 1790, or perhaps occasionally at Col. Hays', who had married her sister. In December, 1790, (while Mrs. Robards was living at her mother's, where Capt. Robards left her on his departure for Kentucky,) Capt. Robards applied to the Legislature of Virginia for a divorce, upon the allegations that his wife had deserted him, &c.; upon which the Legislature authorized a judicial inquiry, and a divorce, if found true.

Whether the suspicions of Capt. Robards at this period were just, and whether Gen. Jackson had injured Capt. Robards in the manner which his jealousies suggested, are facts, as to which, we will present you with such circumstances, testimony and conclusions, as we can obtain or arrive at.

Here we will remark, that if true, it is a charge which should be affirmatively proven by clear evidence of specific facts. Those who make the charge, rely on the act of the Legislature of Virginia, the legal proceedings in Kentucky, with the subsequent acts of General and Mrs. Jackson. The decree of Mercer county court, and what occurred subsequent to the act of the Legislature of Virginia, shall be considered presently.

That Capt. Robards was jealous or suspicious, would probably weigh but little, as he was predisposed that way, and seems to have entertained those feelings long before, in a most violent degree, most unjustly. That the Legislature of Virginia passed the act, which has been referred to, will not probably be considered in any degree as tending to prove the justice of the charge against Mrs. R. by her husband, because the Legislature clearly was not satisfied of the truth of any charge made, and referred it to further inquiry by a court; but of this you will be satisfied by recurrence to General Breckenridge's letter, of which we will here quote a part. "I was a member of the Virginia Legislature in the session of 1790, when a petition was presented in behalf of a Mr. Robards for a divorce. He was said to be resident in one of the counties of the district of Kentucky, then a part of Virginia It was, I believe, the second instance of an application for a divorce that had been made to the Legislature; very certainly the second, that I had been called upon to vote. I was a young man at that time, and the deep impression made on my mind was, the novelty and importance of the case, combined with the interest which I felt in behalf of the female concerned—remain with great distinctness. Mr. Robards was represented to be a man of vile, wild habits, and harsh temper; his wife lovely and *blameless* in her disposition and deportment; so

cruelly treated by her husband as to make a separation necessary to her happiness. It was under impressions produced by a state of facts like these, that I voted for a judicial inquiry on the subject, which I always understood eventuated in a divorce.

"If Mr. Robards alleged incontinency in his wife as a ground of divorce, and I rather think that he did, I am very sure that I thought her *innocent*, and that my vote was intended to liberate her, as the injured party." *(o.)*

In addition to which, we will now call your attention to such positive testimony as we have collected, as to the injustice of Capt. Robards' suspicions, and the charge made against Gen. Jackson.

Judge Overton, who lived in the same room with Gen. Jackson during all the period in question, slept with him, held the strictest and most confidential intimacy with him, states, as his solemn, clear belief, that Mrs. R. was innocent, and most unjustly suspected; that such was the result of his own observations, and such were, at all times, the solemn asseverations of General Jackson during that period, and at all times since. *(p.)* Mrs. Craighead, Mrs. Smith, and Mrs Bowen had the best opportunities of judging correctly: in speaking of Mrs R.'s conduct during the period which elapsed from the time she came from Kentucky, and of the injustice of R.'s suspicions, Mrs. C. says, "I have no hesitation in stating it as my firm belief, that his (Capt. R.'s) suspicions were entirely groundless; no lady ever conducted herself in a more becoming manner, during the whole of that period; I have lived within a few miles of M.s. Jackson's ever since that time, (with the exception of about two years,) and have been intimate with her, and can say, that no lady maintains a better character, or is more exemplary in her deportment, or more beloved by her friends and neighbors." *(q.)*

Mrs. Smith says, "all the circumstances attending this rupture, I cannot attempt to state with much particularity at this late day; but it is hardly possible, considering the free and unreserved intercourse that prevailed amongst all the respectable classes of people here at that time, that an incident of this kind should occur without being fully and generally known; and that every person should concur in the same views upon its character, without the best reasons to this transaction, Mr. Robards alone was censured, and I never heard a respectable man or woman intimate, that the conduct of his wife differed from that of the most prudent and virtuous female. Gen Jackson boarded at the time in the house of Mrs Donelson, and it was the common belief that his character and standing, added to his engaging and sprightly manners, were enough to inflame the mind of poor Robards, addicted, as he was, to vicious habits and the most childish suspicions." *(r.)*

Mrs. Bowen says, "in this transaction, (referring to the jealousy of Robards and his last separation from his wife,) I can safely say from my intimacy with both Mrs. Donelson and her daughter, Mrs. Robards, as well as Gen. Jackson, that not the least censure ought to be thrown upon any person but Mr. Robards.—When the circumstances happened this was the language of all the country, and I never heard, until now, that there was any person living who had, *from a knowledge of the facts*, entertained a different opinion, except Mr. Robards himself, in whose weak and childish disposition I think the whole affair originated." *(s.)*

From this testimony, concurring with the testimony of all the other persons whose statements are subjoined for your examination, there seems to be but one possible conclusion—that the charge made on Gen. Jackson was unfounded, and Mrs. Jackson perfectly innocent; but of this, you and the public will judge; and perhaps more satisfactory upon seeing the further progress of this affair, and the testimony connected with it.

Some time in the month of January, 1791, Mrs. Robards descended the river, to Natchez, under the protection of Col. Stark, an old and respectable gentleman; Gen. Jackson accompanied Col. Stark and Mrs. Robards to Natchez, and so soon as Gen. Jackson saw them safely landed at Natchez, he immediately returned to Nashville—was at the May Superior Court, and attended to business as Attorney General. Mrs. Robards, during her residence in the neighborhood, lived principally in the family of Col. Tho. Green, and Col. Bruen, families as highly respectable as any in that country. The causes of this journey by Mrs. Robards, and the reasons which induced Gen. Jackson to accompany Col. Stark, we will give literally in the language of the testimony of Judge Overton and Mr. Crutcher. Judge Overton says, "some time afterwards, during the winter of 1791, Mrs. Donelson told me of her daughter's intention to go down the river to Natchez, to some of her friends, in order to keep out of the way of Capt. Robards, as she said he had threatened to "*haunt*" her. Knowing, as I did, Capt. Robards' unhappy, jealous disposition, and his temper growing out of it, I thought that she was right to keep out of his way; though do not believe that I so expressed myself to the old lady, or any other person.

"The whole affair gave Jackson great uneasiness—and this will not appear strange to one as well acquainted with his character as I was continually together during our attendance on wilderness courts, whilst other young men were indulging in familiarities with females of relaxed morals, no suspicion of this kind of the world's censure, ever fell to Jackson's share.—In this—in his singularly delicate sense of honor, and in what I thought, his chivalrous conceptions of the female sex, it always occurred to me, that he was distinguishable from every other person with whom I was acquainted.

"About the time of Mrs. Donelson's communication to me respecting her daughter's intention of going to Natchez, I perceived in Jackson symptoms of more than usual concern. I determined to ascertain the cause, when he frankly told me, that he was the most unhappy of men, in having innocently, and unintentionally, been the cause of the loss of the peace and happiness of Mrs Robards, whom he believed to be a fine woman. In this I concurred with him, but remonstrated upon the propriety of his not giving himself any uneasiness about it. It was not long after this before he communicated to

o Appendix, no. 1. p no. 13. q no. 3. r no. 4.

s Appendix, no. 5

me his intention of going to Natchez with Col. Stark, with whom Mrs. Robards was to descend the river—saying that she had no friend or relative that would go with her, or assist in preventing Stark, his family, and Mrs. Robards from being massacred by the Indians, then in a state of war, and exceedingly troublesome.—Accordingly, Jackson in company with Mrs. Robards and Col. Stark, a venerable and highly esteemed old man, and friend of Mrs. Robards, went down the river from Nashville to Natchez, some time in the winter or spring of 1791. It was not, however, without the urgent entreaties of Col. Stark, who wanted protection from the Indians, that Jackson consented to accompany them, of which I had heard, before Jackson's conversation with me, already alluded to." Mr. Crutcher says, "Capt. Robards, never, to my knowledge, returned to West Tennessee, or what was then called Cumberland. It was reported, however, that he threatened to come and take his wife to Kentucky, and compel her to live there. She, as well as all her friends, was very much opposed to this, and in order to place herself beyond his reach, as I understood at the time, determined to descend the river under Col. Stark's protection to Natchez. It was in December, or perhaps January, before Col. Stark could get off with his family, Gen. Jackson also went along; but after they landed at Natchez, the General returned to this country." *(l)*

In the winter or spring of 1791, information was received at Nashville that Captain Robards had obtained a divorce from the Legislature of Virginia: This was the belief of all persons in the country. Mr. Crutcher says, "I do not know how the information reached the country, but it was generally, indeed, I believe, universally, relied on as being correct." Judge Overton's account is substantially the same, and further, that in the summer of 1791 he was in Kentucky, remained part of his time at old Mrs. Robards', and never understood otherwise than that Capt. Robards' divorce was final until the latter part of the year 1793. *(m)*. Of the strength and universality of this opinion there can be no doubt. Upon the receipt and general belief of this information, Gen. Jackson, in July or August, 1791, returned to Natchez in company with Mr. David Deadrick—married Mrs. Robards, and returned in September, 1791, to Nashville with her.

These transactions would seem, under the circumstances accompanying them, to require no comment, and could not fairly be subject to misconstruction, when the character of Gen. Jackson and the conduct and character of Mrs. Jackson are in the slightest degree understood and appreciated; but we will again call your attention to such testimony, as will be entitled to the greatest and most conclusive weight in public estimation.

We cannot do justice to Judge M'Nairy's testimony, but by using his own words—"Gen. Jackson and myself have been acquainted more than forty years; I think 44 or 45 years; part of the time we lived together, and the balance in the immediate neighborhood of each other. We moved together from North Carolina to this State, and arrived at Nashville in October, 1788.

"Not long after we came here, I was informed that Mrs. Jackson and her then husband had been separated in the state of Kentucky. I knew Gen. Jackson had never seen her until this time, and I do not think for some time afterwards. About this time I was informed that Robards and his wife were living very unhappily at her widowed mother's. The public report and impression, I know, was, that Robards was treating her cruelly, by charges found in his own jealous imaginations alone.

"As to the particular facts, which took place, that produced the second separation I have no knowledge of my own—I can only speak of what was the prevailing opinion at the time. But this much I can say, with as much positiveness as any man can, when speaking of another, that from my particular acquaintance with him, I believe General Jackson was, at any period of his life, incapable of seducing any man's wife from him

"I have known Mrs. Jackson for nearly forty years. No woman, for that time has sustained a more irreproachable character than she has—hospitable, kind, and charitable. The evening of her days was hastening to a close in much peace and comfort." *(o.)*

We will also trouble you with quoting from the testimony of Mrs. Smith, on account of its own weight, and more particularly as giving the sentiment and opinions of the Rev. Thos. B. Craighead, known to most literary divines as one of the ablest and most enlightened clergymen in the United States; known to all his acquaintances as a most pious and good man, and one who had the best opportunity to judge correctly of the true character of those transactions, and of Gen. Jackson and Mrs. Jackson. Mrs Smith states, "Mr. Robards had not been long gone from Tennessee when information was received here that he had obtained a divorce from his wife. Whether this information came by letter, or by a newspaper from Virginia, addressed to my husband, I cannot now say with certainty; but I think by the latter It was after this information came, that Gen. Jackson married Mrs. Robards; and I recollect well the observation of the Rev. Mr. Craighead in relation to the marriage; it was, that it was a happy change for Mrs Robards, and highly creditable to Gen. Jackson, who, by this act of his life, evinced his own magnanimity, as well as the purity and innocence of Mrs. Robards; and such was the sentiment of all my acquaintances.

"Since this period, I have lived within a few miles of Mrs. Jackson, and have never been acquainted with a lady more exemplary in her deportment, or one to whom a greater share of the respect and regard of friends and acquaintances can be awarded." *(b)*

The testimony of Judge Overton, Mr. Crutcher, Mr. Anthony Foster, and others, accompanying this letter, proves substantially the same.

In the fall of 1793, Gen. Jackson, for the first time, understood that the act of the Legislature of Virginia only authorized a judicial inquiry and decree of divorce; and that such proceedings had been taken in the Mercer quarter session court, and that a divorce had been

granted in September, 1793. He was then, in January, 1784, married again to Mrs. Jackson. (c)

Of this judicial proceeding and decree, it will only be necessary to remark, that we have given you such evidence as will satisfy you of the true state of the facts, and the innocence of Mrs. Jackson; such as shows that this proceeding was entirely ex parte, and without any knowledge of it by Mrs. Jackson or Gen. Jackson, that at the time when the offence was charged in the petition to have taken place, viz: July, 1, 1790, Mrs. Robards was living at her mother's, where Robards had left her, and where he had promised to return to her. But in addition to all this, we have the strongest reasons to believe that Hugh M'Gary, the only witness who seems to have been introduced on that inquiry, never saw Gen. and Mrs. Jackson together until the month of Sept. 1791, after their marriage at Natchez, when they were living together as married persons, in the most fair, honest, and innocent belief that they were lawfully joined in wedlock. Hugh M'Gary came through the Indian country from Natchez to Nashville, at the same time and in the same company in which General and Mrs. Jackson came, in Sept. 1791, and circumstances then occurred calculated to excite in M'Gary a stronger feeling of dislike towards Gen. Jackson, which it is unnecessary to detail, as they related solely to a meditated attack by the Indians.

The petition for divorce seems not to have been filed until the fall of 1792—tried at Sept. 1793; and there is much greater probability upon an ex parte hearing, that the testimony of Hugh M'Gary was not very accurately applied or confined to the allegations in the declaration, than that he swore that which was untrue; which must have been the case had his evidence agreed with the declaration.

We have now, gentlemen, laid before you the facts connected with Gen. Jackson's marriage—his own conduct, and the character of his Lady. Much more testimony could have been produced, if necessary, proving the same facts substantially, but in our inquiries we have met with none conflicting with this which we presented. The necessity for this course, the members of this Committee have felt with deep regret. Those who reside here cannot be surprised that this regret should exist in *our* bosoms, since some of us have associated with General Jackson and his family for more than thirty years—no one of us for less than twelve. During these periods we and our families have met our distinguished countryman, and his pious, charitable, and amiable lady, in the most elevated ranks of society. In this protracted series of years, we have seen *him* commanding the respect of all men, and the enthusiastic attachment of his friends; *her*, we have seen, deserving and enjoying the kindest attentions of her female acquaintances, and the unqualified and exalted regard of the honorable, moral, and religious men of our country.

The result of this inquiry must place the character of Mrs. Jackson upon that basis where it has rested for nearly forty years, in the society where she has lived and been best known. It must show Gen. Jackson in this part of his history, sustaining that high character for honor and magnanimity, which has distinguished his course through life.

To the honorable and high-minded political opponents of Gen. Jackson, this result will be received with great pleasure—such persons must, at all times, have viewed this attack with pain and dissatisfaction.

R. C. FOSTER,
Chairman pro tem.
G. W. CAMPBELL,
ROBERT WHYTE,
J. WHARTON,
T. H. CLAIBORNE,
WILL. WHITE,
JO. PHILPS,
DANIEL GRAHAM,
WILL. L. BROWN,
ALFRED BALCH,
EDWARD WARD,
WM. B. LEWIS,
FELIX ROBERTSON,
JNO. SHELBY,
JOSIAH NICOL,
JN. CATRON.

NELSON PATTERSON, *Secretary.*

The undersigned has not signed or acted this subject for the obvious reason that his testimony has been given and used.

JOHN McNAIRY.

I have not signed it for the same reason.

JNO. OVERTON.

APPENDIX.

(No. 1.)

FINCASTLE, *April* 8, 1827.

DEAR SIR—I have had the honor of receiving your letter of the 28th ult. and hasten to say, in reply to it, that it is utterly out of my power to give you, with accuracy, the particular facts and circumstances in detail of the transactions alluded to. Such traces of them, however, as a lapse of near forty years has left upon my memory, I will state with great pleasure.

I was a member of the Virginia Legislature, in the session of 1790, when a petition was presented in behalf of a Mr. Robards, for a divorce. He was said to be a resident in one of the counties of the District of Kentucky, then a part of Virginia. It was, I believe, the second instance of an application for a divorce that had been made to the Legislature; very certainly the second that I had been called upon to vote. I was a young man at that time, and the deep impression made on my mind was, the novelty and importance of the case, combined with the interest which I felt in behalf of the female concerned—remain with great distinctness.

Mr. Robards was represented to be a man of vile, wild habits and harsh temper, and his wife lovely and blameless in her disposition and deportment; and so cruelly treated by her husband as to make a separation necessary to her happiness. It was under impressions produced by a state of facts like these, that I voted for a judicial inquiry on the subject, which I always understood eventuated in a divorce.

If Mr. Robards alleged incontinency in his wife, as a ground of divorce, (for I rather think that he did,) I am very sure that I thought her innocent, and that my vote was intended to liberate her, as the injured party.

---

c *Appendix, no.* 13.

Since Gen. Jackson has become so distinguished a military man, I have understood that his wife is the same Mrs. Robards, of whom I have been speaking; and I very often, when that subject has been referred to in conversation, have given the same account of it that you got from Dr. Sim as coming from me. I now rejoice that I have had any agency in enabling Mrs. Jackson to form a new alliance with a soldier, who properly appreciates her worth, and treats her with that generous feeling, which is due to the best portion of our race.

With much esteem, &c., I am your obedient servant,

JAMES BRECKENRIDGE.

[No. 2.]

NASHVILLE, *May 7th*, 1827.

DEAR SIR—You desired me to state my knowledge and opinion of the private character of General Jackson, as it respects his conduct in his connexion and intermarriage with Mrs. Jackson.

General Jackson and myself have been acquainted more than forty years; I think 44 or 45 years; part of the time we lived together, and the balance in the immediate neighborhood of each other. We moved together from North Carolina to this State, and arrived at Nashville in October, 1788.

Not long after we came here, I was informed that Mrs. Jackson and her then husband had been separated in the State of Kentucky. I know Gen. Jackson had never seen her until this time, and I do not think for some time afterwards. About this time I was informed that Robards and his wife were living very unhappily at her widowed mother's. The public report and impression, I know, was, that Robards was treating her cruelly, by charges founded in his own jealous imagination alone.

As to the particular facts which took place, that produced the second separation, I have no knowledge of my own; I can only speak of what was the prevailing opinion at the time. But this much I can say, with as much positiveness as any man can, when speaking of another, that, from my particular acquaintance with him, I believe General Jackson was, at any period of his life, incapable of seducing any man's wife from him.

I have known Mrs. Jackson for nearly forty years. No woman for that time has sustained a more irreproachable character than she has; hospitable, kind, and charitable. The evening of her days was hastening to a close in much peace and comfort.

I do think it was cruel and unmanly to drag her before the public gaze, in the public prints; it would take a very extreme case to justify it.

I am, very respectfully, Sir, your most obedient servant,

JOHN M'NAIRY.

[No. 3.]

The following is the statement of Mrs. Craighead, widow of the Rev. Thomas B. Craighead, late a member of the West Tennessee Presbytery.

Mr. Craighead and myself came to this country about forty-two years ago; and Mrs. Donelson, the mother of Mrs. Jackson, and family, came and settled at the Clover Bottom, in Davison county, Tennessee, the same year. With the family of Mrs. Donelson I was well acquainted; indeed my family had a knowledge of the Donelson connexion for about seventy years. The whole family were respectable, and I lived in habits of intimacy with Mrs. Donelson, during her life, and with Mrs. Jackson, nearly forty years. The character of Mrs. Donelson, the mother of Mrs. Jackson, was without a blemish; and her standing in society was inferior to that of no other lady in the country. She respected religion while she lived, and died in the hope of a happy hereafter.

Mrs. Jackson, then Mrs. Robards, was brought to this country from Kentucky by one of her brothers, a few years after the family had settled themselves here, in consequence, as I understood, of the cruel treatment of her husband, who was said to be a man of jealous disposition and vicious habits. This was manifested by the suspicions he entertained of the improper conduct of his wife. At the time she lived with him, at the house of his mother, in Kentucky, an attorney of the name of Short, also boarded with the old lady. With regard to the unhappy difference which took place between Robards and his wife, it was believed that it arose from the circumstance of Short's living in the same family with Mrs. Robards, and showing her perhaps a little more than ordinary politeness. Mr. James Brown, my brother, who is now at Paris in France, came to this country shortly after Mrs. Robards arrived from Kentucky; and, speaking of her, deeply regretted her misfortunes. He said that he believed her to be a chaste and virtuous woman, and gave as a reason for thinking so, that he was intimate with Mr. Short, and had conversed with him particularly with respect to Mrs. Robards; that he assured him in the strongest and most solemn terms, Mrs. Robards was a worthy virtuous woman, and that the suspicions of her husband were entirely unfounded, cruel, and ungenerous.

Mrs. Robards, after having been driven from her mother-in-law's by the cruel treatment of her husband, Capt. Robards, lived with her mother, Mrs. Donelson, several years, and conducted herself with the greatest propriety, entirely withdrawing herself from all places of public amusement, such as balls, parties, &c. About two years after his wife left Kentucky, Robards came to this country for the purpose of being reconciled to her. He made every acknowledgment, and appeared to be quite penitent for his past conduct, stating, as I understood, at the time, that he did not blame his wife for leaving him, and coming to live with her mother. Shortly after his arrival, by the interference of her friends and acquaintances, she agreed to live with him, on condition that he would settle himself in her mother's neighborhood, to which he gave his consent, and actually purchased a tract of land. After they became reconciled, Mrs Donelson, for the first time, took into her house, as boarders, some al young gentlemen, there being then few, if any regular boarding houses or taverns, among whom were Judge Overton and Gen. Jackson. Having agreed to live together, Robards went back to Kentucky for the purpose of moving his property to this country. Upon his return,

having found Gen. Jackson in the family, his jealousies appeared to revive. This was more particularly manifested towards Gen. Jackson, in consequence, I suppose, of his gay sprightly disposition and courteous manners. From my acquaintance with Mrs. Jackson, I have no hesitation in stating it as my firm belief, that his suspicions were entirely groundless. No lady ever conducted herself in a more becoming manner during the whole of that period. I have lived within a few miles of Mrs. Jackson ever since that time, (with the exception of about two years,) and have been intimate with her, and can say, that no lady maintains a better character, or is more exemplary in her deportment, or more beloved by her friends and neighbors.

ELIZABETH CRAIGHEAD.

Spring Hill, 2d Dec. 1826.

P. S. In addition to what has been stated above, it was my understanding, and the understanding, I believe, of the settlers generally, that, on the application of Capt. Robards, the Legislature of Virginia divorced him from his wife, and I never heard any thing to the contrary until lately. E. C.

[No. 4.]

The statement of Mrs. Smith, widow of Gen. Daniel Smith, formerly the representative of Tennessee in the Senate of the United States.

As well as I now recollect, Mr. Smith and myself settled in this country in the year 1784. At that period, or shortly after it, Mrs. Donelson and family were among the few families who came and settled on the south side of Cumberland river, where, though they were but a few miles from me, yet, in consequence of the river running between us, and the danger of visiting in those days, I did not become personally acquainted with them for two or three years after. The family, however, was universally spoken of as one of the most respectable and worthy in the whole country. The first time that I ever saw Mrs. Jackson, then Mrs. Robards, was at the station of Col. Mansker. One of her brothers had, not long before, brought her from Kentucky, where she and Mr. Robards had been married and settled. The cause of her return to Tennessee was then attributed to the cruel and unjust treatment of her husband, who was spoken of every where as a man of irregular habits, and much given to jealous suspicions.

About two years after I first saw Mrs. Robards, I learned that Robards had arrived in the country, and, by the assistance of the family of his wife, that their differences had been reconciled, and that they were again living together at Mrs. Donelson's. They were not long, however, together, before the same unhappy apprehensions seized the mind of Robards, and the consequence of which was another separation, and, as it soon appeared, a final one. All the circumstances attending this rupture, I cannot attempt to state with much particularity at this late day; but it is hardly possible, considering the free and unreserved intercourse that prevailed amongst all the respectable classes of people here at that time, that an incident of this kind should occur without being fully and generally known, and that every person should concur in the same views upon its character without the best reasons. In this transaction, Mr. Robards alone was censured; and I never heard a respectable man or woman intimate that the conduct of his wife differed from that of the most prudent and virtuous female. Gen Jackson boarded at the time in the house of Mrs. Donelson, and it was the common belief that his character and standing, added to his engaging and sprightly manners, were enough to inflame the mind of poor Robards, addicted, as he was, to vicious habits, and the most childish suspicions.

Mr. Robards had not been long gone from Tennessee when information was received here that he had obtained a divorce from his wife. Whether this information came by letter, or by a newspaper from Virginia addressed to my husband, I cannot now say with certainty, but I think by the latter. It was after this information came, that Gen. Jackson married Mrs. Robards—and I recollect well the observation of the Rev. Mr. Craighead, in relation to the marriage; it was—that it was a happy change for Mrs. Robards, and highly creditable to General Jackson, who, by this act of his life, evinced his own magnanimity, as well as the purity and innocence of Mrs. Robards, and such was the sentiment of all my acquaintances.

Since this period, I have lived within a few miles of Mrs. Jackson, and have never been acquainted with a lady more exemplary in her deportment, or one to whom a greater share of the respect and regard of friends and acquaintances can be awarded.

Given at my plantation, in Sumner county State of Tennessee, on the 15th day of December, 1826. SALLY SMITH.

[No. 5.]

The following is the statement of Mrs. Bowen, widow of Col. William Bowen, deceased, and sister of Gen. Russell, and the late Col Russell, of Fayette county, Ky.; also, mother of the late John H Bowen, for several years a Representative in Congress of the U. S. from Tennessee.

My father married Mrs Campbell, the sister of Patrick Henry, of Virginia, and settled at the Salt works, in Washington county a few miles from Abingdon, Virginia. After this event, about the year 1785, Mr. Bowen and myself moved from Washington, and settled upon the spot where I now live, in Sumner county, Tenn. Soon after our arrival, we became acquainted with the family of Mrs. Donelson, the mother of Mrs. Jackson, who settled the fall after our arrival within a mile of us, and since that period have lived in the same neighborhood. With Mrs. Donelson's family, I have always lived in habits of intimacy and friendship.

At the time of my first acquaintance with the family of Mrs. Donelson, that is, in 1786, her daughter, Mrs. Robards, was then in Kentucky, where she was settled and married. In the year after, I became acquainted with her, having been brought down to this country by her brother, Samuel Donelson, who, as I understood then, and have always since believed, went after her in consequence of the bad treatment which she had received from her husband.—Upon her arrival here I was introduced to her,

and from the intimacy and confidence which soon prevailed between us, I was convinced that the conduct of her husband had been illiberal and unjust. I can safely say, that the deportment of no lady ever seemed to me to be more guarded or more free from those faults which usually give rise to jealousy and ill-will. Some time after this, Mr. Robards came to the country with the view of becoming reconciled again to his wife, as I understood; their differences were made up by the interference of some of the relations of Mrs. Robards, and they agreed to live together again, and did occupy, as I then heard, a separate house in the yard of Mrs. Donelson. It was at this period that the unhappy difference arose which caused another rupture between Mr. and Mrs. Robards, the circumstances of which are as follows, as I now recollect them.—General Jackson and Judge Overton, with some other young gentlemen, were boarding in the family of Mrs. Donelson. General Jackson soon became the object of Captain Robards' jealousy and ill-will, who seemed to indulge the same cruel suspicions in regard to the conduct of his wife, which had led to their separation in Kentucky. The effect of which was, the voluntary withdrawal of the General from the family, while Mr. and Mrs. Robards remained with it. Captain Robards, however, did not long remain, before he set out for Kentucky, whether with the intention of returning I do not know; but he was not long gone before it was understood that a divorce had been granted, upon his application, separating him from his wife. In this transaction I can safely say, from my intimacy, with both Mrs. Donelson and her daughter, Mrs. Robards, as well as General Jackson, that not the least censure ought to be thrown upon any person but Mr. Robards—when the circumstances happened, this was the language of all the country; and I never heard, until now, that there was any person living who had, from a knowledge of the facts, entertained a different opinion, except Mr. Robards himself, in whose weak and child ish disposition, I think the whole affair originated.

Done at my plantation, in Sumner county, Tennessee, this 21st December, 1826.

MARY H. BOWEN.

[No. 6.]

I was living in Nashville when Gen. Jackson first came to this country, and have lived here ever since. I recollect of its being reported that Capt. Lewis Robards had quarrelled with his wife, and refused to live with her. I also recollect that one of the Mr. Donelson's went to Kentucky, and brought his sister, Mrs. Robards, to her mother's. Some time afterwards, Captain Robards came to this country to see his wife; and it was said, not long after he came, that a reconciliation had taken place between them. After they had agreed to live together again, I understood that Captain Robards had previously consented to settle himself in this country, and actually purchased a tract of land in the neighborhood of Mrs. Donelson, the mother of his wife.

About this period of time, General Jackson and Judge Overton, both young lawyers, commenced boarding with Mrs. Donelson, and Captain Robards and his wife lived there. While they were all at Mrs. Donelson's together, I understood that a quarrel, or misunderstanding, took place between Gen. Jackson and Captain Robards, in consequence of which Messrs. Jackson and Overton immediately left the house. Capt. Robards continued to live, however, with Mrs. Donelson, without any interruption, as long as he remained in the country. I have seen Mr. and Mrs. Robards together in Nashville, and have seen them together at Col. Hays', where they have stayed days and nights.

I never heard of Gen. Jackson and Captain Robards having any quarrel, or misunderstanding, but the once, nor do I believe they ever did.

The latter part of May or some time in June, about this time having some business in Kentucky, it was known that I intended going to that country; and as Capt. Robards intended going also, he requested me to let him know when I would be ready to start. When I was ready to set out on my journey, I went by Mrs. Donelson's for Captain Robards; on my arrival I found Mrs. Robards and her mother busily engaged in packing up his clothes and provisions. I suppose it was about an hour before Captain Robards was ready to start. I inquired for Col. Donelson, and was told that he had just rode down the branch, to either Blackemore's or Davis' Fort, on some business. When we were ready to start, Capt. Robards, with much apparent friendship, took his leave of Mrs. Donelson, and his wife, walking to the gate with him, and in a very tender and affectionate manner took her leave of her. There was not, when we mounted our horses, nor at any time after I got there, a single white person on the plantation, except Captain Robards, his wife, and Mrs. Donelson. I had three horses and Captain Robards two; but on the second night we camped on the Barrens, his riding horse strayed off, which we could not, after diligent search, find. I then let him have the use of one of mine, to carry his pack, and he rode his own pack-horse.—In the course of that day he appeared to lament very much the loss of his riding horse: I remarked to him, that the horse would perhaps make into Pitman's station; or that some hunter would find him, and he would get him again as he moved down. To this he made a very harsh reply—he said he would be *demned* if ever he would be seen in Cumberland again; with many other quite angry and ill-natured remarks. I observed to him that the friends of Mrs. Robards would not like, and perhaps would not consent, for her to go back to Kentucky to live. He said he did not care what they liked or disliked; he should do as he thought proper. As his conduct on this occasion was so unexpected, and at the same time so unaccountable to me, I thought it best to say nothing more to him; but I was convinced, from many other circumstances and remarks of his, that he never intended coming back to this country to live. We travelled on together to Nelson county, Kentucky, and near Bardstown, at a Mr. Pottenger's, we parted. Capt. Robards never, to my knowledge, returned to West Tennessee, or what was then called Cumberland. It was reported, however, that he threatened to come and take his wife to Kentucky, and

ompel her to [illegible] there. She, as well as all her friends, was very much opposed to this; and in order to place herself beyond his reach, as I understood at the time, determined to descend the river in company with Col. Stark's family, and under the Colapel's protection, to Natchez. It was in December before Colonel Stark could get off with his family; perhaps January before he could get along. General Jackson also went along; but after they landed at Natchez, the General returned to this country. About this time it was reported here that the Legislature of Virginia had granted a divorce to Capt. Robards. I do not know how the information reached this country, but it was generally, indeed I believe universally relied on as being correct. After this, the General went to the lower country again, where he stayed but a little while; and on his return brought Mrs. Jackson with him, to whom it was said he had been married in West Florida, then a Spanish Province: this every person believed, and they were received with great cordiality by their friends.

When, however, it was discovered that the Legislature of Virginia had not actually divorced Robards and his wife, and believing that, consequently, their first marriage was illegal, the General and Mrs. Jackson determined to get married again, and accordingly were married in this county, on the 17th day of January, 1794, as will appear by examining the bond for marriage license now on file in the Clerk's office for Davidson county. They have lived together, ever since, as happily and as much respected as any people in the world. I was acquainted with Mrs. Jackson while she was Mrs. Robards—I have been well and intimately acquainted with her ever since, and can say, that she always supported a fair and unblemished character, and is as much esteemed and beloved by her friends and neighbors, as any other lady whatever.

THO. CRUTCHER.

The Honorable
R. C. Foster. *May* 4, 1827.

[No. 8.]

Harrodsburg, Mercer Co. Ky.
April 13th, 1827.

Dear Sir: In answer to your request, in relation to a publication in the last Spirit of Seventy-Six, involving the character of Mrs. Jackson, in which I am referred to as being one of the Jury who found a verdict against her, I say *that it is utterly untrue.* I was well acquainted with Mrs. Jackson previous to her first marriage with Lewis Robards, and several years afterwards, and can assure you that she sustained an unblemished character, and was considered one among the first of our young ladies; her father, Col. Donelson, being a man of the most respectable standing. After her marriage with Mr. Robards, a disagreement took place between her and her husband, on account of charges of immoral conduct on his part, and also becoming jealous of a certain individual, (not Gen. Jackson,) which eventuated in her being compelled to return to her mother, who had, in the mean time, removed to the State of Tennessee, where her father died or was killed by the Indians. I was intimate with Mr. Robards, and after the separation, in a conversation with him, he admitted to me that his suspicions were unjust, and he expressly acquitted her of any illicit intercourse with the individual suspected. As to Gen. Jackson, I am of the opinion he never saw her previous to her separation from Mr. Robards, and the divorce I believe, was obtained *entirely ex parte*; an act of the Virginia Legislature was passed at the instance of the well known Cap. Jack Jouett, then a member of that body, and a brother-in-law of Mr. Robards, (having married his sister,) and without any notice, as I believe, to Mrs. Robards; but of this, I suppose, Maj. Thomas Allin, who was the Clerk of the Court, can speak. For my part, I consider Mrs. Jackson as most unjustly and ungenerously slandered. I am well acquainted with most of the circumstances, and regret to see the whole transaction misrepresented. I have always believed that Mr. Robards had no person to blame but his own improper conduct and jealousy. I know him well, but do not wish to enter into a detail of facts calculated to wound the feelings of his respectable relations and friends. I am, myself, for General Jackson as next President, and wish the Spirit of Seventy-Six not again to refer to me without authority, as I consider the attack on Mrs. Jackson as ungenerous, unmanly, and unjust.

Yours, with respect,
JAMES RAY.

[No. 9.]

Mr. John McGinnis states, that he lived, for some considerable time, in the immediate neighborhood of Mrs. Betsey Robards, the mother of Lewis Robards, the former husband of the present Mrs. Jackson; that Robards and his wife then lived with old Mrs. Robards; that Lewis Robards was generally considered a bad husband; that his mother acknowledged that Rachael Robards was an amiable woman, and deserved better treatment; that she, in fact, loved her as well as any child she ever raised; that old Mrs. Robards told this affiant, a short time before Mrs. R. Robards left her husband for the purpose of returning to her mother's, in Tennessee, that her son had ordered his wife to clear herself, and never again show her face in his house; that she appeared, for some time before she returned to her mother's, to be an unhappy and miserable woman; that, finally, her brother came to Kentucky, and carried her off to her friends in Tennessee. He states, explicitly, that he never heard of General Jackson being in the neighborhood, and that he believes that General Jackson never visited the house of Lewis Robards during the time that they lived together; that Robards's wife sustained a fair and irreproachable character, as long as this affiant knew her.

This day personally appeared before me, a Justice of the Peace for the county of Mercer, the within named John McGinnis, and made oath to the truth of the within statement. Given under my hand this 13th April, 1827.

C. W. THOMPSON, J. P.

[No. 10.]

Harrodsburg, *March* 31*st*, 1826.

Dear Major: In compliance with your wishes, expressed in yours of yesterday, it may not be improper to inform you, that in the fall of

the year 1781, I made my place of residence in Lincoln county, (now Mercer) where I have continued to live ever since. I think it was in 1782, not later than 1783, (but I think the former,) I became a Deputy Sheriff in Lincoln, and acquainted with Col. Donelson and his family; the Colonel had then two daughters young ladies, viz: Jane and Rachel, the latter of whom, I understand, is the lady of Gen. Andrew Jackson. Some time shortly after my acquaintance in the family, Miss Rachel became the wife of Captain Lewis Robards of the same county, who then lived in the family of his mother, a widow lady, near Harrodsburg, where he brought his wife, and continued to live with her in the family of his mother, until some disagreement took place between the Captain and his wife, which resulted in a separation, and the Captain sent her to her father, who, previous to that separation, had removed to the neighborhood of Nashville, Tennessee, as I was informed; and where, I presume, she first saw and became acquainted with Gen. Jackson. I never saw General Jackson in my life to my knowledge, nor have I any reason to believe, nor do I believe that Mrs. Jackson ever was acquainted with the General until after her separation with Robards, and her arrival at her father's, in Tennessee. Captain Robards obtained a special act of the Virginia Legislature for a divorce, I think in the fall of the year 1787, and prosecuted the same to judgment in the Quarter Session Court of Mercer county, (of which Court I was the clerk,) at the September Term of said court, 1793. About that time, Capt. Robards married a Miss Winn, daughter of Mr. Thomas Winn, then I think of Louisville or Bardstown.

I was surprised when the separation took place between Capt. Robards and his first wife, as previous to that affair, I had ever considered Mrs. Robards, now Mrs. Jackson, a fine woman, and of irreproachable character. Upon an examination of the papers of the suit for the divorce aforesaid, I find nothing showing that the defendant had any kind of notice of the existence or progress of that suit. Should you consider any thing I have communicated worth notice, you are at liberty to use it in any way you may think proper.

Your friend, &c.

THOS. ALLIN.

Major Thomas P. Moore.

[No. 11.]

To all whom it may concern, be it known, that in the year 1784 I lived at Col. John Bowman's station, in the then county of Lincoln, now Mercer, and have continued to live in Mercer county ever since. Whilst I lived at Col. Bowman's, I became acquainted with Col. Donelson and his family, who lived then near Col. Bowman's. Col. Donelson at that time, had two single daughters, young women, to wit: Jane and Rachel, the latter of whom, I understand, is the present Mrs. Jackson, the lady of Gen. Andrew Jackson, of the State of Tennessee. I continued to be intimately acquainted with Col. Donelson and his daughters, until the younger, Rachel, was married to Capt. Lewis Robards, and for some time afterwards, when some unhappy difference arose between Capt. Robards and his lady, which terminated in a separation between them; and when Mrs Robards went to her father's, who had previous to that time removed to the State of Tennessee, near to Nashville. Previous to that separation, I have ever considered that lady's character as fair and irreproachable as that of any other lady I ever knew in my life; nor have I any reason to believe that Gen. Jackson ever saw her until her separation from Robards. I recollect being one of the jury when Robards obtained his divorce, but have not the most distant recollection of what evidence was offered on the trial.

JOHN MEAUX.

April 16th, 1827.

[No. 12.]

NASHVILLE, *August* 12, 1824.

Caleb Atwater, Esq.

SIR: Mr. Curry, the Postmaster of this place, has showed me a letter you addressed to him, stating the manner in which Gen. Jackson was married, as reported in your country, in a manner disgraceful and immoral in him.

Mr. Curry has requested me to write to you on that subject. I have to remark, that I have been intimately acquainted with Gen. Jackson, for about 35 years past—before his marriage and since; during all which time, the General and myself have lived in this place and the neighborhood. Something like thirty years ago, or more, Gen Jackson was married to Mrs. Jackson, his lady, with whom he has ever since lived, as I believe, in the utmost harmony, in the highest respect and credit amongst all who knew them, but more especially among their immediate neighbors.

Mrs. Jackson has been once married to a Mr. Robards, who, as I always understood, and believed, without any just cause, left her, and obtained a divorce by an *ex parte* proceeding out of this State.

I am, most respectfully, your ob't serv't,

A. FOSTER.

[No. 13.]

May 8th, 1827.

DEAR SIR: In the fall of 1787, I became a boarder in the family of Mrs. Robards, the mother of Lewis Robards, of Mercer county, Ky. Captain Robards and his wife then lived with old Mrs. Robards. I had not lived there many weeks before I understood that Capt. Robards and his wife lived very unhappily, on account of his being jealous of Mr. Short. My brother, who was a boarder, informed me that great uneasiness had existed in the family for some time before my arrival; but as he had the confidence and good will of all parties, a portion of this confidence fell to my share, particularly the old lady's, than whom, perhaps, a more amiable woman never lived. The uneasiness between Capt. Robards and lady continued to increase, and with it, great distress of the mother, and considerably with the family generally, until early in the year 1788, as well as now recollected. I understood from the old lady, and perhaps others of the family, that her son Lewis had written to Mrs. Robards' mother, the widow Donelson, requesting that she would take her home, as he did not intend to live with her any longer. Certain it is, that Mrs. Robards' brother, Samuel Donelson, came up to carry her

town to her mother's, and my impression is, in the fall or summer of 1788. I was present when Mr. Samuel Donelson arrived at Mrs. Robards', and when he started away with his sister; my clear and distinct recollection is, that it was said to be a final separation, at the instance of Capt. Robards—for I well recollect the distress of old Mrs. Robards on account of her daughter-in-law, Rachael, going away, on account of the separation that was about to take place, together with the circumstance of the old lady's embracing her affectionately. In unreserved conversations with me, the old lady always blamed her son Lewis, and took the part of her daughter-in-law.

During my residence in Mrs. Robards' family, I do not recollect to have heard any of the family censure young Mrs. Robards, on account of the difference between her husband and herself: if they thought otherwise, it was unknown to me—but recollect frequently to have heard the old lady and Capt. Joliett, who married the elder daughter of the family, at that time, express the most favorable sentiments of her.

Having finished my studies in the winter of '88-9, it was determined to fix my residence in the country now called West Tennessee. Previous to my departure from Mrs. Robards, the old lady earnestly entreated me to use my exertion, to get her son Lewis, and daughter-in-law, Rachael, to live happily together again.

Their separation for a considerable time had occasioned her great uneasiness, as she appeared to be much attached to her daughter-in law—and she to her. Captain Lewis Robards appeared to be unhappy, and the old lady told me she regretted what had taken place, and wished to be reconciled to his wife. Before I would agree to concern in the matter, I determined to ascertain Capt. Robards' disposition from himself, and took an occasion to converse with him on the subject, when he assured me of his regret respecting what had passed; that he was convinced his suspicions were unfounded; that he wished to live with his wife, and requested that I would use my exertions to restore harmony.—I told him I would undertake it, provided he would throw aside all nonsensical notions about jealousy, for which I was convinced there was no ground, and treat his wife kindly as other men. He assured me it should be so; and it is my impression now, that I received a message from old Mrs. Robards to Mrs. Lewis Robards, which I delivered to her on my arrival at her mother's, where I found her some time in the month of February or March, 1789. The situation of the country induced me to solicit Mrs. Donelson to board me—good accommodations and boarding being rarely to be met with—to which she readily assented.

Mr. A. Jackson had studied the law at Salisbury, North Carolina, as I understood, and had arrived in this country in company with Judge McNairy, Bennet, Searcy, and perhaps David Allison, all lawyers, seeking their fortunes, not more than a month or two before my arrival. Whether Mr. Jackson was at Mrs. Donelson's, when I first got there in March 1789, I cannot say; if he was, it must have been but a little time. My impression now is, that he was not living there, and having just arrived, I introduced him into the family as a boarder, after becoming acquainted with him. So it was, we commenced boarding there about the same time, Jackson and myself, our friends and clients, &c. occupying one cabin, and the family another, a few steps from it.

Soon after my arrival, I had frequent conversations with Mrs. Lewis Robards, on the subject of living happily with her husband. She, with much sensibility, assured me that no effort to do so should be wanting on her part, and I communicated the result to Capt. Robards and his mother, from both of whom I received congratulation and thanks. Capt. Robards had previously purchased a pre-emption in this country, on the south side of Cumberland river, in Davidson county, about five miles from where Mrs. Donelson then lived. In the arrangement for a re-union between Capt. Robards and his wife, I understood it was agreed that Captain Robards was to live in this country, instead of Kentucky; that until it was safe to go on his own land, which was yearly expected, he and his wife were to live at Mrs. Donelson's. Capt. Robards became re-united to his wife some time in the year 1788 or 1789. Both Mr. Jackson and myself boarded in the family of Mrs. Donelson—lived in the cabin room, and slept in the same bed. As young men of the same pursuits and profession, with but few others in the country with whom to associate, beside sharing, as we frequently did, common dangers, such an intimacy ensued as might reasonably be expected

Not many months elapsed before Robards became jealous of Jackson, which I feel confident was without the least ground. Some of his irritating conversation on this subject with his wife, I heard amidst the tears of herself and her mother, who were greatly distressed. I urged to Robards the unmanliness of his conduct, after the pains I had taken to produce harmony, as a mutual friend of both families, and my honest conviction that his suspicions were groundless. These remonstrances seemed not to have the desired effect; as much commotion and unhappiness prevailed in the family as in that of Mr. Robards in Kentucky. At length I communicated to Jackson the unpleasant situation of living in a family where there was so much disturbance, and concluded by telling him that we would endeavor to get some other place; to this he readily assented, but where to go we did not know. Being conscious of his innocence, he said that he would talk to Robards. What passed between Capt. Robards and Jackson I do not know, as I was absent some where, not now recollected, when the conversation and results took place, but returned soon afterwards. The whole affair was related to me by Mrs. Donelson, (the mother of Mrs. Robards,) and, as well as I recollect, by Jackson himself. The substance of their account was, that Mr. Jackson met Capt. Robards near the orchard fence, and began mildly to remonstrate with him respecting the injustice he had done his wife as well as himself. In a little time Robards became violently angry and abusive, and threatened to whip Jackson, made a show of doing so, &c. Jackson told him he had not bodily strength to fight him, nor should he do so, feeling conscious of his innocence, and retired to his cabin, telling him, at the same time, that if he insisted on fighting, he would

give him gentlemanly satisfaction, or words to that effect. Upon Jackson's return out of the house, Capt. Robards said that he did not care for him nor his wife—abusing them both—that he was determined not to live with Mrs. Robards. Jackson retired from the family, and went to live at Mansker's station. Capt. Robards remained several months with his wife, and then went to Kentucky in company with dr. Thomas Crutcher, and probably some other persons.

Soon after this affair, Mrs. Robards went to live at Col. Hays', who married her sister. After a short attendence, I returned to live at Mrs. Donelson's, at her earnest entreaty, every family then desiring the association of male friends as a protection against the Indians. This affair took place, to the best of my recollection, in the spring of 1790. Some time in the fall following, there was a report afloat that Capt. Robards intended to come down and take his wife to Kentucky; whence it originated I do not now recollect, but it created great uneasiness both with Mrs. Donelson and her daughter, Mrs Robards, the latter of whom was much distressed, as she was convinced after two fair trials, as she said, that it would be impossible to live with Capt. Robards, and of this opinion was I, with all those I conversed with, who were acquainted with the circumstances. Some time afterwards, during the winter of 1791, Mrs. Donelson told me of her daughter's intention to go down the river to Natchez, to some of their friends, in order to keep out of the way of Capt. Robards, as she said he had threatened to "*haunt*" her; knowing, as I did, Capt. Robards' unhappy jealous disposition, and his temper growing out of it, I thought she was right to keep out of his way, though do not believe that I so expressed myself to the old lady or any other person.

The whole affair gave Jackson great uneasiness; and this will not appear strange to one as well acquainted with his character as I was.—Continually together during our attendance on wilderness courts, whilst other young men were indulging in familiarities with females of relaxed morals, no suspicion of this kind of the world's censure fell on Jackson's share. In this—in his singularly delicate sense of honor, and in what I thought his chivalrous conceptions of the female sex, it occurred to me, that he was distinguishable from every other person with whom I was acquainted.

About the time of Mrs. Donelson's communication to me respecting her daughter's intention of going to Natchez, I perceived in Jackson symptoms of more than usual concern. I determined to ascertain the cause, when he frankly told me, that he was the most unhappy of men in having innocently, and unintentionally been the cause of the loss of peace and happiness of Mrs. Robards, whom he believed to be a fine woman; in this I concurred with him, but remonstrated upon the propriety of his not giving himself any uneasiness about it. It was not long after this, before he communicated to me his intention of going to Natchez with Col. Stark, with whom Mrs. Robards was to descend the river—saying that she had no friend or relation that would go with her, or assist in preventing Stark, his family, and Mrs. Robards from being massacred by the Indians, then in a state of war and exceedingly troublesome.—Accordingly, Jackson in company with Mrs. Robards and Col. Stark, a venerable and highly esteemed old man and friend of Mrs. Robards, went down the river from Nashville to Natchez, some time in the winter or spring of 1791. It was not, however, without the urgent entreaties of Col. Stark, who wanted protection from the Indians, that Jackson consented to accompany them, of which I had heard before Jackson's conversation with me already alluded to.

Previously to Jackson's starting, he committed all his law business to me, at the same time assuring me that as soon as he should see Col. Stark and family and Mrs. Robards situated with their friends in the neighborhood of Natchez, he would return and resume his practice. He descended the river; returned from Natchez to Nashville, and was at the Superior Court in the latter place in May 1791, attending to his business as a Lawyer and Solicitor General for the Government. About, or shortly after this time, we were informed that a divorce had been granted by the Legislature of Virginia through the influence principally of Capt. Robards' brother-in-law, Major John Joliett, who was probably in the Legislature at that time.

This application had been anticipated by me. —The divorce was understood by the people of this country to have been granted by the Legislature of Virginia, in the winter of 1790, 1791. I was in Kentucky in the summer of 1791, remained at old Mrs. Robards', my former place of residence, part of my time, and never understood otherwise than that Captain Robards' divorce was final, until the latter part of the year 1793. In the summer of 1791 Gen. Jackson went to Natchez; and, I understood, married Mrs. Robards, then believed to be freed from Capt. Robards by the divorce: in the fall of 1791 returned to Nashville settled in the neighborhood of it, where they have lived ever since, beloved and esteemed by all classes.

About the month of December, 1793, after Gen. Jackson and myself had started to Jonesborough, in East Tennessee, where we practised law, I learnt for the first time that Capt. Robards had applied to Mercer Court, in Kentucky, for a divorce, which had then recently been granted; and that the Legislature had not absolutely granted a divorce, but left it for the Court to do. I need not express to you my surprise, on learning that the act of the Virginia Legislature had not divorced Capt. Robards. I informed Gen Jackson of it, who was equally surprised; and during our conversation, I suggested the propriety of his procuring a license on his return home, and having the marriage ceremony again performed, so as to prevent all future cavilling on the subject.

To this suggestion he replied—that he had long since been married, on the belief that a divorce had been obtained; which was the understanding of every person in the country; nor was it without difficulty he could be induced to believe otherwise.

On our return home from Jonesborough, in January, 1794, to Nashville, a license was obtained, and the marriage ceremony performed.

The slowness and inaccuracy with which information was received in West Tennessee at that time, will not be surprising, when we consider its insulated and dangerous situation, sur-

rounded on every side by a wilderness and by hostile Indians, and that there was no mail established till about 1797, as well as I recollect.

Since the year 1791, Gen. Jackson and myself have never been much apart, except when he was in the army. I have been intimate in his family, and from the mutual and uninterrupted happiness of the General and Mrs. Jackson, which I have at all times witnessed with pleasure, as well as those delicate and polite attentions which have ever been mutually reciprocated between them, I have been long confirmed in the opinion that there never existed any other than what was believed to be the most honorable and virtuous intercourse between them. Before their going to Natchez, I had daily opportunities of being convinced that there was none other; before being married in the Natchez country, after it was understood that a divorce had been granted by the Legislature of Virginia, it is believed there was none.

JOHN OVERTON.

The Hon. R. C. FOSTER,
Chairman of the Select Committee.

The Editors of the United States' Telegraph, feel that they almost owe an apology to the public for calling its attention to the strong and irresistible refutation which the foregoing testimony furnishes, at once of the innocence of a much injured and most amiable woman, and the inhuman and infamous Vandalism by which her reputation has been assailed.

These are subjects so sacred in their character, (and what can be more so than a woman's honor?)that even the effort to defend and sustain them involves, however successfully this office may be performed, a seeming and revolting delicacy. Nothing therefore, would have induced us to have invaded, even in the spirit of friendship and a militant vindication, those domestic recesses which are chosen sanctuaries, but for a recent reprint in this city, of Charles Hammond's most infamous and most memorable slander against Mrs. Jackson.

The public will bear in mind that this new edition of a foul and refuted calumny, made its appearance very shortly after the late visit of this wretch to this city. Shall we apologize to the second officer in the executive for the employment of this appropriate epithet towards his bosom, confidential, and inestimable friend? No, Mr. Clay, if you take this miscreant to your heart, you must, with the benefits resulting from his attacks *upon a woman!* share a portion of the *honor* of such an association. It will not do for you, after degrading yourself by voluntary companionship with a coward, whose versatility in infamy fits him at once to be the scavenger of the filth, and the hired assassin, of his party, to repudiate his friendship. You must be content to go down to posterity, (if the poor reptile can live beyond the Summer sun that warms him into existence,) as the *fidus Achates* of him who was publicly and ignominiously chastised for his treasonable toryism during our recent war, and has since added a higher claim to baseness by calumniating—widely, falsely calumniating, a virtuous and venerable woman!! And for what? To make her husband odious, by catering for your ambition and lust of power.

When we apprize the public that of this atrocious pamphlet at least twenty thousand copies have probably issued from the press in this city, the expense of which has, in all likelihood, been defrayed from some one of the contingent funds of the Departments, by undue profits allowed on public printing, it will be possible to estimate the indefatigable malice of the master spirits of the Coalition and their humble tools.

But what will the gallant, chivalrous and high-minded freemen of our country think, when they are informed that the large portion of this large impression of this work has been enveloped at the Capitol, by the messengers of Congress, in the public stationary, and distributed under the frank of some of its members!! We state and avouch this fact on the highest authority, and challenge contradiction. The member who has been the most willing and industrious drone in this loathsome drudgery, is the *Honorable* Mr. John Sloane, of Ohio, whose chief occupation at this place, is to be the privileged amanuensis of calumny. This patriot in the operation of franking is a machine of vast power and efficiency, and it is believed that the daily falsehood which Messrs. Gales & Seaton strike off by steam, is not evolved with the celerity and effect with which this gentleman writes "*Free—John Sloane,*" on the calumnies he distributes, not alone in Ohio, but as it will be seen by the subjoined letter, to other parts of the Union. This poor hound, taken off of the scent of the six militiamen, by the lash of public opinion, is now opening on another track, for which the instincts of the animal amply qualify him. In real life there has, perhaps, never been exhibited an instance of such vulgar, indomitable malice. Shakspeare has given us but a glimpse of what Mr. Sloane must be, in the mild and decent virtues of Caliban.

From the fangs of such monsters we have done little else than to rescue Mrs. Jackson. This is to be found in the triumphant vindication which we have just presented to the reader. Desperate, indeed, must be the fortunes of that faction, which, having exhausted every stratagem which cunning or malice could supply, against a Soldier of two wars and a cherished Patriot, defeated, convicted, and punished as it has been, now turns upon an inoffensive and unoffending woman, the partner of his bosom, the venerable companion of his declining years—her whose influence is felt, in the circle where she lives, by the practice of every virtue which belongs to the tenderness, the dignity, the sensibility of her sex. Men of America! will you endure this? No! The impulse of public gratitude will be nerved by a sense of justice—and the villifiers of their country's honor, the poor, trafficking hucksters for her offices, and the base calumniators of a Woman, defenceless by the public manacles by which her husband is bound, will be consigned to a common and unmitigated infamy, in which they will live in the detestation, but be survived by the scorn of their countrymen.

BATTLETOWN, (Va.) March 22, 1828.

Gentlemen: This day's mail brought to this office a pamphlet (addressed to George H. Norris, Esq. and franked by J. Sloane,) called A View of General Jackson's Domestic Relation-

in reference to his fitness for the Presidency. It would be well for you to take especial notice of this book—and of Mr. Sloane, who franks it.

Yours in haste,

GEO. S. LANE.

Messrs. GREEN & JARVIS.

The Journal, a paper, once edited, and now in the confidence of Mr. Adams, has called us to account for presuming to dictate to the Senate upon the expected nomination of Mr. Webster. These gentlemen are very solicitous about the dignity of the Senate! But as the paroxism is sudden, it will not, probably, continue long. How long is it since they abused this body with the utmost intemperance, for the alleged crime of permitting its deliberations to become scenes of disorder? But the Journal is on a wrong scent. We never attempted dictation to the Senate, or any other body. We have expressed our opinions freely and independently upon the purity of Mr. Webster; and shall continue to pronounce him unworthy of all confidence, as a duty we owe to the people. If the Journal cannot speak independently, it is not a proper censor of those who can.

The Journal deems it very arrogant and disrespectful in the Printers to the Senate, to express any opinions upon the official proceedings of that body. *Silence*, such as the Journal recommends, was not a condition upon which we accepted the trust alluded to, or would accept any; nor would those to whose votes we are indebted for it, have conferred it upon any one whom they thought capable of being purchased. We can distinguish between the independent republican and the venal sycophant. The one can accept a public trust without relinquishing his right to criticise the political movements of those who confer it. The other thinks that such trust renders him a humble drudge, from whom the birth-right of speaking or thinking is taken away. When we attempt to dictate, we will plead guilty to the charge of the Journal. While we merely discharge our duty to the Senate as printers, and to the people as editors, and without violating the courtesy due to any body, we can only plead guilty to the charge of being different from the factucians of that *chaste, virtuous* and *able* paper.

From the American Sentinel.

SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.

The application for the incorporation of the American Sunday School Union has been the subject of much discussion in the news papers as well as in the legislative hall. The sermon preached by Dr. Ely on the 4th of July last, having been handled severely in debate, has induced its republication in pamphlet form, together with an appendix designed to vindicate the liberty of Christians. This pamphlet contains extracts from the speeches delivered in the Senate on the bill chartering the Sunday School Union. This pamphlet is offered for sale at A. Finley's Bookstore, corner of Fourth and Chesnut Streets, from which we copy the concluding observations of the author:

To the honorable gentlemen who have introduced my sermon to considerable distinction, I tender my thanks, because their strictures, whether just or unjust, will have a tendency to promote the consideration of the truth, and the more extended influence of Christian principle in our future elections.

Some of the errors, however, into which these learned commentators have fallen, ought to be corrected.

It is not true that I have ever advocated *the union of Church and State* in any publication from the pulpit or press: but on the contrary, in my discourse on the 4th of July last, the very discourse which is adduced as proof of a disposition friendly to such a union, it is distinctly stated,

"I would guard, however, against misunderstanding and misrepresentation, when I state, that all our rulers ought in their official stations to serve the Lord Jesus Christ. *I do not wish any religious test to be prescribed by constitution, and proposed to a man on his acceptance of any public trust. Neither can any intelligent friend of his country and of true religion desire the establishment of any one religious sect by civil law. Let the religion of the Bible rest on that everlasting rock, and on those spiritual laws, on which Jehovah has founded his kingdom: let Christianity by the Spirit of Christ in her members support herself.* LET CHURCH AND STATE BE FOR EVER DISTINCT: but still, let the doctrines and precepts of Christ govern all men, in their relations and employments."

It did not suit the convenience of the persons who furnished the Senate with extracts from my sermon, to give them a sight of these lines, which originally stood as they now stand, in immediate connexion with some of the extracts published.

For twenty years past I have publicly returned thanks, on almost every Lord's Day, for our civil and religious liberties, and for our freedom in this happy country from an unhallowed union of Church and State; and I can confidently assure my fellow-citizens, that there is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, neither Minister nor Elder in the Presbyterian Church in the United States who is an advocate for any establishment of any religious sect by any civil government. Our whole system of Presbyterian Church government coincides with the civil liberty and the representative governments of our country. All our pastors are *chosen* by their congregations, and all our ruling Elders in our Sessions and Presbyteries are the *representatives* of the people.

It is not true that I ever was the *Agent* of the American Sunday School Union, or "*in full confidence and league*" with that Institution, in the sense in which two of the Senators would convince their constituents that I am. Last May a committee of the Managers of that Union, requested me to compile their annual report for them, from documents which they furnished. That labour I performed. The Managers took my compilation into their own hands: and altered it according to their own pleasure. Subsequently I read the report in public. At another time, by particular request, I examined a small publication, which they re-printed. This is all the connexion I ever had with the Sunday School Union, direct or indirect; if you except the purchase of a few of their books: the ob-

taining of one donation in books from them for Cantonment Leavenworth, in the Missouri Territory; and the contribution, lately, of a small sum to their funds. It is not more than 3 months since I first became a subscriber of any thing to this truly philanthropic charity. I hope, however, in future to become more effectually their fellow servant in their benevolent operations, as some compensation for the injury intended them, and partially done them, by the discharge of broken fragments of my discourse at their devoted head. There is reason to hope, that the resistance which the School Union has experienced in the Senate, will commend it to the more ardent friendship of all who love the progress of knowledge, liberty, and piety in our land.

It was an error in the honorable Mr. Duncan, to speak of my discourse as having been delivered at *Norristown*. He was probably led into this mistake by some representations in the newspapers of a sermon which I preached in that place on the second of September last.

In illustration of the assertion, that we can form correct notions of the moral character of a being whom we have never seen, I reminded my hearers, that they had all formed some conceptions of the moral character of Washington, and latterly of General Jackson. My notions of his character might be correct, or incorrect; but I would tell them an anecdote, which I thought conveyed a just idea of him. I then stated what I now reiterate:

That between three and four years prior to the General's being first nominated as a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Somerville, then an accomplished young officer in the Navy, but since deceased, informed some of my family connexions, that he had lately spent a week in the General's company, at his own house; that the General appeared to him to be greatly changed in several respects; and, that the General had said to him, in a very serious and impressive manner, "YOU MAY DEPEND UPON IT, SOMERVILLE, THAT, WITHOUT TRUE RELIGION, THERE IS NO HAPPINESS IN THE PRESENT LIFE, AND NONE TO BE EXPECTED IN THE NEXT." I told my hearers, that this is a true saying; and I was aware that, coming from a distinguished fellow citizen, it might have some influence with *some men* who more regard the word of their deservedly favorite Hero, than the word of God.

This statement has been shamefully distorted; but I think the anecdote worthy of any pulpit, and calculated to do good. Would to God that many admirers of General Jackson would record this among many of his patriotic and excellent sentiments, on the tablets of their hearts! They would then cease to think him likely to prove a patron of their exterminating party zeal, and licentious lives. I have repeated the same anecdote, years ago, in Flemington, N. J.; and in August last in Huntingdon, in this State. My numerous hearers will recollect the anecdote If ever the General should be President, as I freely acknowledge it is my hope that he may be, I may predict, from my knowledge of him, without the spirit of prophecy, that he will disappoint many of his friends and foes, by being the impartial, temperate, prudent, and exemplary Chief Magistrate of the whole nation.

Mr. Duncan has intimated that my discourse on the 4th of July, "was preached in favor of the election of General Jackson." How far this is true, every person who will read, may judge for himself. Those who represent Gen. Jackson as one of the worst of men, must think my sermon a point blank shot into his heart.

Since, however, I have been called in question about my politics before the Senate, I will here state, for I fear nothing from candor, that Mrs. Jackson, (for the politics of the day include her,) is an eminently pious woman, and has sustained this character for about a quarter of a century. On the subject of baptism, I believe she is a Baptist, and has been immersed. I have heard no evil said of her, by those who know her, unless it be this, *that she prefers a prayer meeting to a palace;* and this will not *sink* her in the estimation of any who do not forget their religion in their politics.

Of the General I shall say, that he is as far from *hypocrisy* as any man living; and shall give a few extracts from some of his letters, which I think will show him in his private character, in a true light. I must beg his pardon for making, without the opportunity of asking his consent, the present use of his friendly communications to me.

Under date of Nashville, April 21st, 1823, he thus writes me on the subject of a clergyman who had been suspended for many years on account of some imputed errors in doctrine:

"SIR—Being informed by my friend, the Rev. Mr. C. of this place, that the case of the aged, pious, and reverend Thomas B. Craighead, is to be discussed before the General Assembly at Philadelphia, at its approaching session, I feel it my duty to address you on that subject.

Having known Mr. Craighead from my boyhood,—having been raised in the neighbourhood in which he commenced his ministry;—having been wafted by fortune to this Western Country, in which he had settled himself, and presided over a congregation large and respectable;—and having, for the last thirty-four years of my life lived within five miles of his house; I am authorized in saying that I have a full knowledge of him, both in his private walks and public ministry. And if we are justified in judging the tree by its fruits, I can with great truth testify, that no man has laboured with more zeal in the ministry, and that none have been more respected for piety, or more revered as Christians, and as men. He has done much good, and would have done still more, but for the unhappy difference which arose between him and some of the clergy in Kentucky on some doctrinal points. This, originating warmth of discussion, was carried, perhaps, too far; and enlisting advocates nearly poised on both sides, limited the extent of his services, and has ended in his suspension for some years:—a circumstance which has been much regretted by a great proportion of the good citizens, and Christian professors here; and has injuriously affected, as I believe, the Presbyterian cause.

To see a venerable man, whose hairs have grown gray in the service of his God; a man whose walks have been those of piety, morality, and the benevolence of true religion; respected by all—but deprived of the benefit of communion, and for that which many, very many of the most pious Presbyterians, cannot re-

gard as inconsistent with the Holy Scriptures, which are the guide of all Christians; has filled us here with much regret: and it may be truly said, that nothing would give more general satisfaction, or tend more to the prosperity of this church, than his restoration.

Disunion is evil in both Church and State; and the present is the period, when every means consistent with the principles of true religion, ought to be employed to restore harmony and union to the Christian cause. 'Tis religion to inculcate charity, and, if a brother err, to forgive him. And in the sincere reliance upon those principles, while I shall be respected of any view to dictate to the calm deliberation of the Assembly, I hope that this address will be excused, from my desire to represent fairly the character of the aged and pious Mr. Craighead. This alone has been my motive; and to have done less, would have been injustice to my own feeling, as well as to the interests of the Church."

Under date of Washington, Jan. 1st, 1824, on the same subject, the General writes to me: "Before I close this letter, will you again permit me to bring to your recollection the case of my aged and pious friend, the Rev. Mr. Craighead, and request that you will endeavor to have his case finally considered before your next General Assembly. My prayer is, that he may be restored to his Church, and fellowship with the Christian brethren. This, and this alone, can bring his hoary head in peace to the grave."

Suffice it here to say, that soon after this, the case of Mr. Craighead was finally reviewed, he was restored to the ministry and the Presbytery within whose bounds he resided, with the full approbation of the Assembly, and has since retired to his everlasting rest.

One short extract more is from a letter dated at his Hermitage, July 12th, 1827, in which the General says:

"Having been educated and brought up under the discipline of the Presbyterian rule, (my mother being a member of that Church) I have always had a preference for it. Amongst the greatest blessings secured to us under our Constitution, is the liberty of worshipping God as our conscience dictates. All true Christians love each other, and while here below ought to harmonize: for all must unite in the realms above. I have thought one evidence of true religion is, when all those who believe in the ample atonement of our crucified Saviour are found in harmony and friendship together.

"My enemies have charged me with every crime but hypocrisy. I believe they have never alleged this against me: and I can assure you no change of circumstances, no exalted office can work a change upon me. I will remain uniformly the same, whether in the chair of state, or at the Hermitage. My habits are too well fixed now to be altered."

Such as these extracts from his letters, written without any conception of their ever being made public, indicate him to be, I believe General Jackson is. I have never affirmed, that he is a renewed man, by the power of Divine grace. That question must be left with himself and his Maker.

I have declared my knowledge of the fact, that he is the avowed friend of Christianity: and I claim the liberty of thinking and speaking as freely on this subject as those numerous Editors of papers, who for the sake of abusing the candidate for the Presidency whom they oppose, have been very abundant in their vituperations of myself.

No office, no worldly emolument do I seek. I feel no conviction of having prostituted the pulpit, for the promotion of sinister, party purposes. My desire is, that correct religious principles may govern myself, and all of my fellow-citizens *in all* the transactions of private and public life. I freely confess that I esteem Gen. Jackson much; and I love my country much; but I love Christ more.

PROPOSALS

For publishing once a week, from the 1st of March to the 15th of October,

FOR ONE DOLLAR,

The United States' Telegraph---Extra.

ANDREW JACKSON is *the candidate of the People.* But union and concert of action are necessary to success. The organized efforts of the administration are fitted for effect, and vigorous exertions are required to counteract them. In aid of such exertions, the undersigned have been advised to issue a WEEKLY PAPER, on terms that will enable them merely to defray the expense of publication. Located at the Seat of Government, having access to the public libraries, and the command of official documents, possessing already a large share of public confidence, and the advantages of a central position and extensive correspondence, they may aver that, in issuing such a publication, they can aid, in some degree, the great cause of truth and the PEOPLE.

If numerous individuals throughout the country, and the corresponding committees in the several States, counties, and townships of the Union, should unite in giving circulation, the undersigned will be more than compensated for the labor that will devolve on them, by the facility which it will afford for disseminating truth among the people.

They therefore propose to publish THE UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH EXTRA, weekly, until the 15th of October next, for ONE DOLLAR, payable, in *all cases*, in advance. *This paper will be devoted exclusively to* the Presidential election, and will contain official documents, and such essays, original and selected, as, in the judgment of the Editors will most promote the election of the Democratic Republican Candidates, ANDREW JACKSON and JOHN C. CALHOUN.

DUFF GREEN.
RUSSELL JARVIS.

They also improve this opportunity to inform the public that they publish the UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH, daily, for . . . . $10 per annum.
Do. do. three times per week during the session of Congress, and twice per week during the recess, for 5 per annum.
Do. do. do. for 3 per 6 months.
United States' Telegraph, weekly, for 4 per annum.

Three Subscribers uniting, and remitting Ten Dollars in current bills, will receive a number of the weekly paper each, for one year.

EXTRA weekly, from the 1st of March to the 15th October, containing 528 super-royal octavo pages, in pamphlet, stitched, ONE DOLLAR.

☞ The first number will be furnished to those who may hereafter become Subscribers.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, APRIL 5, 1828. No. 4.

From the Nashville Republican.

To the Editors of the Richmond Enquirer.

Gentlemen; Since my last communication, I have read the address reported by Mr. Johnson to the Adams convention in Richmond, and I find it to be a fabric of simulated fears raised on a foundation of antiquated slanders—void of facts, destitute of truth, and patched up with theological zeal and forensic stratagem. It reminds me of the men of straw, dressed in cast off hats and coats, and stationed as scare-crows in the corn-fields of Virginia. Decked in the pap-stained garments of Binns, Gales and Hammond, it is calculated to deter very close examination; but as it is avowedly the work of Mr. Johnson, and looked on by him with the eyes of Pygmalion, I risk the displeasure of fastidious readers, and undertake to expose it.

But do not the proceedings of this convention give birth to a reflection too solemn to be unuttered—that in the ruling state of this confederacy, a commonwealth teeming with patriotism, and rich in renown, which, "when asked for her jewels, *still* points to her sons"—men of high station and repute should be found, concerting by an organized effort the renovation of exploded falsehoods, in order to tarnish the fame of a private citizen, whose great exploits and popular virtues make him formidable to a weak and corrupt administration? And does it not add to the gloom of this reflection, that the holy places of prayer and the exalted tribunals of justice, should furnish recruits to this conspiracy against the character of a venerable patriot, and the liberty of a youthful republic? But let not the lover of freedom—let not the votaries of truth despair—let not the friends of the country tremble. The People are not only the fountain of political power, but of political hope. Guarded by the press, which, in spite of the expensive efforts of Mr. Clay to seduce or intimidate it, is yet free, the institutions of our country will find strength and perpetuity against the machinations of the few, in the pure love of freedom which animates the great body of the nation. To their sure and sagacious patriotism, it is perhaps fortunate that frequent appeals are necessary. Even the labors of the Richmond convention may in this way prove useful, as the serpents which Hercules strangled in his cradle, may be supposed to have invigorated him for the greater task of cleansing the Augean stable. There is certainly much to admire in the rhetoric and the reason of Mr. Johnson, in founding a claim for the convention to peculiar sincerity and particular attention, upon the remarkable fact of the month of January (which they chose to assemble) being an "inclement season!" But he might have mentioned a much more extraordinary circumstance, and counted on the attraction of more general notice. He might have told the people of Virginia that he and his compatriots were careful to select the day which had been consecrated by more than half the nation to the honor of General Jackson and to public gratitude—the day on which the altars of freemen burn with incense and their hearts with joy, for the more signal and embittered opportunity of pouring out upon him a collected torrent of abuse. That while the people of Louisiana were hailing him as their saviour, the legislature as their deliverer, the ladies as their protector, the children as their guardian, and the patriarch* as his friend, they had predetermined to be employed in denouncing him in the name of that very legislature and that very people, as the slave of ignoble passions, the tyrant of Louisiana, the enemy of the people he saved, and the foe of that liberty which he defended. This would have constituted as effective an appeal to public notice as the shivering allusion to a January journey.

This frigid exordium gives place to a scale of their opinions respecting Mr. Adams, tenderly graduated from a shade of modest objection, to the florid glow of courtly adulation, where the manly tone for which Chapman Johnson once had credit through Virginia, is artfully lost in the pathic and pensioned phrases of the Whig; and for a harsh and unqualified avowal of their hostility to Gen. Jackson. "Most of us," say they, "approve the general course of the administration, have confidence in its virtue, its patriotism, its wisdom, and see nothing to condemn in the President's interpretation of the federal constitution." "The measures which some disapprove in the present administration, none could hope to see amended under that of General Jackson." "The constitution which we would preserve from the too liberal interpretation of Mr. Adams, we would yet more zealously defend against the destroying hand of his rival."

With these fair and well digested sentiments, Mr. Johnson proceeds to controvert the accuracy of the general belief that Jackson is the favorite of the people; in doing which, he falls into what logicians call a *vicious circle*, forgetting evidently that the best possible proof of that fact, is the general belief of it. And it happens accordingly that the only reasonable part of his argument on this point, is what he doubtless thought no argument at all—viz. a positive denial of it. He next endeavors to rebut the objections which have so widely prevailed and been so completely established, to the last election, by misrepresenting them, as *black boys* give themselves a command over the ears by stocking them.—"The friends of general Jackson," he asserts, "insist that his plurality of votes at the last election, proved him to be the choice of the nation." Now the fact

* Father Antoine.

s, the friends of General Jackson have done no such thing. They contended, and do now contend, that his plurality of votes, placing him nearer to the point of popular preference, made decisive by the constitution, than either of his competitors, it was the duty of the representatives of the people, when they came to estimate the comparative claims of the candidates, to allow this circumstance great weight, and make it overbalance strong preferences for his rivals, or strong prepossessions against himself.—They further maintained that when the right of choice was transferred from electors appointed by the people, to electors delegated by the States, a fact which had not arisen in the first process, should have had a fair operation in the second —viz. that in several of the western States, where Jackson was second to Clay before the people, he became first as soon as Clay was withdrawn. Mr. Johnson describes the primary election as popular and the secondary as federal; and he must admit that the moment which advanced the process from the primary to the secondary stage, expunged the name of Mr. Clay from the list of candidates, and left the popular will of those States to operate in favor of Jackson, Adams or Crawford. Their delegations were bound to give a genuine expression of that will, and to gather it from such facts as were then before them. They had to determine who was the most popular in their respective States, Jackson, Adams or Crawford. If the Kentucky delegation looked to their polls, they found that the same evidence which proved Mr. Clay to stand before General Jackson in the popularity of Kentucky, proved General Jackson to stand before Mr. Adams or Mr. Crawford. They knew that some of their own body preferred him even to Mr. Clay; that a large majority of the Legislature of Kentucky were in favor of his election; and that a general impression, resting on a mass of undoubted facts, existed, that he was next to Mr. Clay in the estimation of the western people.

These were the only facts upon which they could found a faithful course of action at the time, and they could leave no doubt that if they made the will of the people the rule of their conduct, they should vote for General Jackson The course of events has evolved others which confirm that conclusion. The elections in Kentucky, Missouri and Illinois, have proved incontestably what Mr. Johnson earnestly denies, that in the last Presidential election, "the will of the people was improperly disappointed by their representatives." That is, if the people who elected Messrs. Daniel, Yancey, Chilton, Lyon, Duncan and Bates, to the present Congress, know their own will as well as Mr. Johnson does.

The charge of corruption, which Mr. Clay fixed upon himself and his flexible friends at the last election—under which some of them pine in painful obscurity, and he himself writhes in splendid disgrace—Mr. Johnson affirms, was met by Mr. Clay as soon as it was preferred, and abandoned by its supporters when they were challenged for proof.—This the reader will at once recognise as the empty and incautious language of Mr. Clay himself, on those occasions upon which he has been permitted to exchange his cheap and gascon eloquence, for the wine and mutton of his entertainers. Its having been adopted by a set of Virginia politicians, removes those objections which occur to giving it even brief consideration.

It is to be observed that the charge of Mr. Kremer was prospective; imported that Mr. Clay and his friends *would* vote for Mr. Adams; and that in consideration thereof, Mr. Clay was to be appointed Secretary of State. As soon as this charge was avowed by Mr. Kremer, Mr. Clay appealed to the House of Representatives for a solemn investigation of it, before the election—before either of the overt acts prospectively charged by Kremer could have occurred. Mr. Clay could not vote for Mr. Adams, nor Mr. Adams appoint Mr. Clay, before the election. Did it argue any thing like innocence in Mr. Clay to defy Mr. Kremer to prove the charge, at a time when its consummation, its only substantial proof, had not been effected; and when it was in the power of Mr. Clay himself to disappoint the most conclusive evidence of intention that could be exhibited, by declining to give the venal vote, and to receive the mercenary appointment. The fact that he did challenge an investigation at a time when it was impossible to convict him, and has declined one since it was possible, is proof sufficient, if other proof did not abound, that the motive of venality alleged against him by Mr. Kremer really existed.* Let those who may be so far beguil-

*In a case like Mr. Clay's, where the judgment is to operate on the concealed motives of the mind, it would appear that the best evidence is to be derived from the justificatory declarations of the accused person. All other circumstances have but a probable connexion with his motives, these have a necessary one. The former are directed at them, the latter proceed from them; and wherever they conflict with truth, they show to demonstration, a consciousness of guilt, and an effort to conceal it. To apply this rule—in his circular to his constituents, of March, 1825, his first real attempt at justification, he says:—"I found myself transformed from a candidate before the people, to an elector for the people. I deliberately examined the duties incident to this new attitude, and weighed all the facts before me, upon which my judgment was to be formed or reviewed. If the eagerness of any of the heated partisans of the respective candidates suggested a tardiness in the declaration of my intentions, I believed that the new relation in which I was placed to the subject, imposed on me an obligation to pay some respect to delicacy and decorum." Here he declares to his constituents that he was tardy in the declaration of his intentions, after he became transformed into an elector for the people, both because he was beset by heated partisans, and because his new relation to the election imposed on him obligations of delicacy and decorum. But in his pamphlet, his last, or rather, his latest attempt at justification, he says, (p. 18.) "Mr. Bouligny, Senator from Louisiana, bore to me the first authentic information which I received of the vote of Louisiana, and consequently of my exclusion from the house. And yet in our first interview, in answer to an inquiry which he made, I told him without hesitation, that I should vote for Mr. Adams in preference to Gen. Jackson." Was this tardiness, delicacy, or decorum? In the very "first interview," and on the very first inquiry, after he "found himself placed in the new attitude of elector for the people," so far from being tardy, delicate, or decorous, on the subject, he avows his intentions "to vote for Mr. Adams in preference to Gen. Jackson." Now suppose a man to come to his death by being poisoned with arsenic; and that a suspected person, when arraigned for the murder, should, upon his first examination affirm, that the arsenic which he bought was all used in poisoning rats, and on his second that he had bought no arsenic at all, would not his contradiction rivet on the minds of the jury a conviction of his guilt? And yet it is not so flagrant as that of Mr. Clay—for one branch of his is carried out into a complaint against "heated partisans," and into a claim to the refinement of "delicacy and decorum." Again.—He insists (p. 18.) that on the 15th Dec. when the vote of Louisiana and his consequent exclusion from the House, were only conjectured from report, not authentically known, and of course when he was but half "transformed into an elector for the people, he told Mr. James Barbour, who had himself just been transformed from an "eager partisan" of Mr. Crawford, to an "eager partisan" of Mr. Adams, that "in the event of the contest being narrowed down to Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson, he was in favor of Mr. Adams." And to prove still fur-

ed by the sophistry of Mr. Clay and his parasites as to hope for any relief to his reputation from Mr. Kremer's failure to convict him, suppose for a moment that Paulding, Williams and Van Wart, who captured Andre and led to the detection of Arnold's treason, had only charged him with *intending* to deliver up West Point for a lucrative appointment in the British Army. Suppose Arnold had then demanded an investigation of this charge before a military tribunal, and had challenged its supporters to the proof. Suppose *these* patriots had failed, as they must have done, to convict him—that he had then held the treasonable correspondence with Sir H. Clinton and received the lucrative appointment—would it be possible to extract any proof of his innocence from the result of the investigation? Could any friend of his attempt such an imposition on the common sense of mankind; or would the most sceptical historian consider this circumstance as diminishing by a grain of doubt, the mass of evidence against him? The parallelism of these cases cannot be denied; and the only historical variation between them is, that Arnold's emissary was apprehended, and that Clay's has not been. How cruelly absurd then is it, for the adherents of the Secretary of State to recur to this mock investigation in chanting his praise; and how desperate must be, the condition of that man's character, which, when criminated by the circumstances of his own conduct, can be vindicated only by a mode of justification which leads directly to the demonstration of his guilt? The author of the address adds to this absurdity, another, which, as he is an expert and approved attorney, is as remarkable as it is obvious. He asserts that General Jackson has given the sanction of his name to the charge of corruption under which the Secretary labours. It will be remembered that Mr. Clay himself has eagerly assumed this position. But it is in direct opsition to truth. Gen. Jackson has never adopted the charge or given it the sanction of his name. He has only testified to a fact having connexion with it, and instead of being a prosecutor, he is a witness—a distinction, to which no ordinary intemperance of zeal could have blinded Mr. Johnson.

These abortive attempts to justify the last election, and to criminate all who were offended by its impurity, are preliminary to a formal vindication of the conduct and doctrines of the President, and to a studied and detailed misrepresentation of every feature in Gen. Jackson's character, and every act of his life. In conformity with this division of his subject, Mr. Johnson imputes the general dissatisfaction which succeeded the first message of Mr. Adams "to unwarrantable inferences" drawn from some of his expressions by the "factious opposition:"—thus, notwithstanding his loyal hatred of military chieftains, adopting the old military maxim of carrying the war into the enemy's country. The phrase "palsied by the will of our constituents," he declares, "has been turn from its context, misinterpreted, and used as the authority upon which the President is charged with the heresy, that the representative owes no obligation to the will of his constituents." The spirit of a recent convert seems here to animate the languid formality of Mr. Johnson's style, and there is something soft if not tender, in his lament over the fate of this exquisite figure of Mr. Adams!—

> "Oh, hadst thou, cruel! been content to seize
> Hairs less in sight, or any hairs but these."

But Mr. Johnson has evidently nothing of poetry in his soul, but the fiction, and his sorrow will accordingly be found to be more causeless than that of Belinda. In that paragraph of the message which begins, "The spirit of improvement is abroad upon the earth," the representatives of the nation are told that "Liberty is power; that the nation blessed with the largest portion of liberty," (intimating his inbred opinion that even the freest nation ought to be under a wholesome reservation of liberty by their rulers,) "must, in proportion to its numbers, be the most powerful nation upon earth; and that the tenure of power by man, is, in the moral purposes of the Creator, upon condition that it shall be exercised to ends of beneficence, to improve the condition of himself and his fellow men. While foreign nations, less blessed with that freedom which is power, than ourselves, are advancing with gigantic strides in the career of public improvement, were we to slumber in indolence, fold up our arms, and proclaim to the world, that we are palsied by the will of our constituents, would it not be to cast away the bounties of Providence, and doom ourselves to perpetual inferiority?" It must be confessed that this passage, which would be as well placed on a page of Newton's Principia as in a President's message, is sufficiently tumid and obscure, and cannot be charged with any very direct signification. But its import, when carefully interpreted, certainly amounts to this. *There are two rules of political action for our government—one, derived from that condition, (jure divino) which in the execution of his moral purposes the Creator attaches to the tenure of power and the possession of liberty, which is power, by man. The other, that which emanates from the will of the people. Under the operation of the first rule, foreign nations, enjoying less of that liberty which is power, than ourselves, and consequently less energetically impressed by the condition attached by the Creator, to its tenure, are advancing with gigantic strides, in the career of public improvement, and exerting their power "to ends of beneficence," in conformity with the moral purposes of our Creator. If we do not also advance "with gigantic strides in the career of public improvement"—if we forbear to exert our power "to ends of beneficence," we shall "cast away the bounties of Providence and doom ourselves to perpetual inferiority to foreign nations." Shall revolt from the great rule which is imposed by the Creator upon free nations, and shall in fact proclaim to the world that we are reduced by the will of our constituents, to a political impotence as feeble and uncouth as the muscular action of a palsied frame.*

It must be admitted that not only are the two rules here proposed, but that the power of contrast, and the effect of comparison, are exerted

---

ther his "tardiness," "delicacy and decorum," he avers (p. 19, 20,) that immediately after the 20th of Dec. when Mr. Bouligny gave him the first authentic information of his exclusion from the House, and consequent transformation into "an elector for the people," he told Gen. Lafayette "that he had concluded to vote for Mr. Adams." These contradictions carry the evidence against him, as far as the force of moral proof can go.

to the best of Mr. Adams' ability to induce Congress to prefer the first and to despise the second. But in case Mr. Johnson should be disposed to dispute this point, it may be well to add a little more of the precious context from which this "morsel for a King" has been torn by the ruthless republicans. Mr. Adams proceeds—"In the course of the year now drawing to its close, we have beheld, under the auspices and at the expense of one State of this Union, a new University unfolding its portals to the sons of science, and holding up the torch of human improvement to eyes that seek the light. We have seen under the persevering and enlightened enterprise of another State, the waters of our western lakes mingled with those of the ocean. If undertakings like these have been accomplished, in the compass of a few years, by the authority of single members of our confederation, can we, the representative authorities of the whole Union, fall behind our fellow servants in the exercise of the trust committed to us for the benefit of our common sovereign, by the accomplishment of works important to the whole, and to which neither the authority nor the resources of any one State can be adequate." Here evidently another standard of power is recommended to the Congress, hardly less indefinite and alarming than the former. It is urged that inasmuch as the authority and resources of Virginia and New York, have been adequate to the erection of a new University, and the completion of the Grand Canal, it is the duty of the representative authorities of the whole Union to exercise power and resources sufficient for the construction of works and the expansion of improvement, as much beyond these particular enterprises as the resources of the whole Union exceed those of either of these States. And the authority of the general government, instead of being measured by the grants and reservations of the constitution, is to be regulated by the inverse proportion which the whole confederacy bears to a particular State. Thus, according to Mr. Adams, the moral condition of our existence, and the physical circumstances of our Union, conspire to absolve the representative from obedience to the will of his constituents. And it cannot fail to be perceived, that under this florid and umbrageous diction, lurks the offensive idea of patronizing the people and improving the States, which all men with a spark of freedom in their souls must abhor, as strenuously as nature does a *vacuum*. With equalized and success it is attempted to justify the terms of infinite assumption and imperious menace with which Mr. Adams reprehended certain proceedings of the State of Georgia. I have not before me that remarkable communication, but I am willing to take Mr. Johnson's extenuated statement of its substance, in order to prove how richly both its author and its advocate deserve the reprobation of an enlightened people. The latter says, "he made an obvious though not an avowed reference to his oath of office, as imposing an obligation above all human law." Now this is either an intellectual absurdity or a political sin. The Constitution of the United States, denominated by Mr. Johnson himself, "the supreme law of the land," prescribes certain duties for the President, among which is that of taking the oath of office. To say that the performance of this one duty imposes on the President an obligation above the supreme law of the land, and the very law which prescribes it, is to say that the creature is above the creator; and that the sanction of a religious ceremony to the obligation of the President to *preserve, protect and defend* the constitution, endows him with a right to violate his oath and to destroy the constitution. Again—to say that his oath of office imposes an obligation above the supreme law, or requires at his hand the performance of other duties, than those prescribed by the constitution, is avowing at once that this is not a government of laws, and that the executive branch is above the control of the constitution. In the first sense, the expression is absurd; in the second, criminal; in both sufficiently offensive; and to be fair with Mr. Johnson, he is welcome to ascribe it as he pleases, either to want of sense or want of principle, in his hero.

In palliating the more questionable demerits of the president in regard to his equivocal support of that policy which inclines to an exorbitant tariff of duties on imports, for the purpose of encouraging domestic manufactures, Mr. Johnson shines more as a panegyrist than as an economist or civilian. All liberal men agree that error of opinion on this subject involves no radical defect of principle. Large divisions of our territory and population, are the seats of adverse doctrines on this momentous and yet experimental matter, and as they are all animated by undoubted patriotism, there is every reason to hope that the true point beyond which the right of taxation vested in the federal government ought not to be carried, will be seasonably determined by the luminous collision of their respective systems. Already important light has been shed on the matter by the author of Brutus, in the Charleston Mercury. He maintains that the exercise of the taxing power was intended by the framers of the constitution to be confined to the purpose of revenue, and that whenever it might become expedient for the industry of any quarter of the Union, to encourage the production of a particular commodity, it was designed that the State or States interested therein, should assume the qualified exercise of the taxing power, "with the consent of Congress, and on condition that the duties so raised should be paid into the Treasury of the United States." Whoever reads his essays will feel persuaded that his explication of many important questions involving the powers of the General Government, is both original and profound, and promises the establishment of a fiscal policy consonant to the spirit of the constitution and conducive to the preservation of the Union. I wish it could be said that either of these great objects was likely to be advanced by the dissertation of Mr. Johnson, the polarity of whose mind seems insensible to their high attraction, and to turn with trembling constancy to the foot of the throne. The right of the government, accordingly, he deduces from its practice, as an attorney establishes principle by precedent, and as if the government of the United States were to improve every thing but its own practices. He insists that the doctrine of indirect taxation was practised upon by the Administration of Washington, and by that of all his successors—giving into a fallacy, which, though it makes his argument plausible, renders it unsound.

The power of taxation, like other powers

vested in the general government, has an object *direct* and objects *resulting*. Its *direct* object is the raising of revenue; among its *resulting* objects is the encouragement of domestic manufactures. This is clearly secondary in intention, and subordinate in importance to the first object. It must accordingly be increased or diminished, as the scale of taxation is enlarged or contracted. But it is an inversion of the order of things, as well as a perversion of the meaning of the constitution, to say that the scale of revenue is to be enlarged, not to supply the necessary expenses, or to pay the debts of the nation, but to increase the *resulting* action of the taxing power—a power which plainly would never have been intrusted to the general government but for the necessity which exists in all governments for its *direct* object, revenue. Hence it does not follow, as Mr. Johnson labors to show, because Gen. Washington established a tariff of duties, and succeeding administrations increased it, that his policy and the policy of his successors was, in this respect, the same. Gen. Washington's policy went no further than the *direct* object of the taxing power required. The lightest duty on the importation of English boots communicates some degree of encouragement to American boot makers and tanners; and as that no similar duties must be imposed in order to provide in the most convenient way for the expenses of government, it is certainly a mitigation of the necessary evil of taxation, that a useful branch of domestic industry should be promoted by it. But the mitigation of an evil does not make it a good. And the objection which lies against the policy of Mr. Adams, and in a less degree against that of Mr. Monroe, is, that it proposes to exercise the taxing power not for its *direct* object, and no doubt constitutional end, but for its *resulting* objects—not for a sufficient revenue, but for a multitude of manufactures; thus transcending the particular design and violating the general spirit of the constitution, by taxing one part of the community for the benefit of another, making the relative condition of the southern States worse than it was before the Union, giving the manufacturing States greater privileges than they would have enjoyed without it; and burthening a great, salutary and venerable branch of human industry, for one less extensive and less favorable to the physical wants and moral condition of mankind.—Let the report of Mr. Secretary Rush, in which he proposes the artificial and oppressive system of England as a model for the financial policy of this country, and talks about *regulating* every fibre of labor, and every species of property in this vast confederacy of free States, by a nicely balanced machinery of encouraging taxation, be examined, and the inordinate and unconstitutional excess of Mr. Adams' policy in the employment of the taxing power, will at once be perceived.

Nor will the force of this contrast be at all weakened by the fact which Mr. Johnson relies on—viz. that the law of '89, laying the first duties imposed under the constitution, and advocated by Mr. Madison, then a member of Congress, recites in its preamble, that the laying of duties "was necessary for the support of government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, *and the encouragement and protection of domestic manufactures.*" The government was then new, and just getting into operation. The important and searching power of taxation was then first to be applied to the inhabitants and property of a number of free States who had confided it reluctantly, with many misgivings and hesitations, to the federal head. Under these circumstances, it was the duty of Congress, and no doubt their aim, to make the first act of taxation as palatable as possible, to recommend it as strongly as they could to the people, upon whose opinion they knew the whole fabric of government rested. They therefore recited in the preamble, the two great circumstances which rendered taxation necessary, and the one which was most likely to render it acceptable. The first was addressed to their patriotism, the second to their honor, the third to their interest—powerful appeals to paramount motives. This was the object of the preamble, as the least insight into the circumstances of the period would have taught Mr. Johnson, and as is apparent from the fact, that subsequent bills of revenue contain no such recitations. It is hard to forbear a smile at reflecting on the derision and surprise with which the sages of '89 would look on this attempt to legalize a broad and encroaching system of policy, not by expounding the terms or analysing the spirit of the constitution, but by italicising a phrase "torn from its context" in the corner of a preamble to an act.

But he contends that whether Mr. Adams be right or wrong in respect to the tariff, or his "ineffably gigantic" schemes of internal improvement, his friends may applaud and the nation trust him, because his opinions are at least as right as those of General Jackson. This, although it will turn out to be an improvement upon the old absurdity of *ignotum per ignotius*, is probably the most fair and formidable inference in the address: for, as Hooker has said, that *change even from the worse, is sometimes inconvenient*, there might be some colour of reason in advising the American people to rest satisfied with Adams, seeing that Jackson's opinions coincided with his. But unfortunately for Mr. Johnson, even this slender argument is denied him by the assertion of the Richmond meeting, by which his convention stands publicly affiliated, and to which he sent in his memorable adhesion. That assertion is not disavowed or disputed, and is of course adopted by Mr. Johnson's address, and it declares that "Gen. Jackson shrouds his opinions of the tariff in impenetrable mystery." While these opinions are thus concealed in "impenetrable mystery," how does Mr. Johnson discover that they coincide exactly with those of Mr. Adams? The detection of such an insidious inconsistency as this, in the grave, earnest and public affirmations of a man of Mr. Johnson's standing, must affect even his adversaries with more regret than pleasure, and excite a feeling of tender abhorrence, like that which induces us to pity and approve the execution of a criminal.

Having with these infelicitous errors, both of argument and assertion, endeavored to justify the doctrines of Mr. Adams, (avoiding carefully all mention of "the constitutional competency,") and having enjoined upon the American people (what was no doubt modestly meant) the duty of applying to the consideration of

the President's conduct, that indulgent rule of construction which ensures impunity to guilt rather than security to innocence, Mr. Johnson proceeds with a sudden change of temperature, to make a portentous reference to the vast and delicate duties of the chief magistrate, and fierce allusions to the temper and actions of General Jackson. No part of the address discovers a colder prejudice or a more fervent loyalty than this. The Richmond, is like the Roman courtier, *in odio sævus, blandiloquentia comis.* It is really surprising to see the same pen running with the lightness of Camilla's step over the faults of the man in power, and falling with the demolishing tread of an elephant on the virtues of a private citizen. Like the "lithe proboscis" of that shrewd animal, however, it handles tenderly what is frail, and what is sound rudely; and the quick-sighted people of Virginia will neither be inflamed into injustice by Mr. Johnson's violence nor deceived into submission by his gentleness. As if emphasis were not ridiculous in *stale* misrepresentations, and a tone of deep-mouthed vituperation natural to those whose accusations are unsupported by fact, he tells them, with an air of amazing confidence, that General Jackson has "trampled on the laws and constitution of his country, has sacrificed the lives and liberties of men, and made his own arbitrary will, the rule of his conduct." But his fundamental position is this—"Capacity for civil affairs, in a country like ours, where the road to preferment is open to merit in every class of society, is never long concealed, and seldom left in retirement." It is then added, that "General Jackson has lived beyond the age of sixty years, and was bred to the profession best calculated to improve and display the faculties which civil employments require; but the history of his public life in those employments is told in a few brief lines in a single page of his biographer. He filled successively and for very short periods, the office of member of the Tennessee Convention, which formed their State Constitution, Representative and Senator in Congress, Judge of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, and again Senator in Congress of the United States." Where a man is so *very* didactic as Mr. Johnson is, accuracy of knowledge and precision of detail might be expected. But these humble constituents of truth lie far beneath the range of his romantic fancy, as the reader who chooses to consult Eaton's work will find.* The account of Jackson's "civil employments" is not contained on a "single page" of that work, and Mr. Johnson's summary of it is defective as to the very important office of Attorney General, which Washington, no mean judge of merit, himself conferred. But if we admire the fidelity of his statements, we shall be amazed at the accuracy of his reasoning. He concludes, that as capacity for civil offices is in this country "never long concealed and seldom left in retirement," the frequent appointment and repeated election of Gen. Jackson is proof positive of his notorious incapacity to fill them. There is something transcendental in this syllogism. And if we reflect that in addition to Mr. Johnson's corrected list of civil offices, Gen. Jackson has filled the important ones of commissioner for receiving the cession of Florida, of Governor of that Territory under the Spanish laws, and negotiator of several of our most important Indian treaties; that he never solicited an office in his life, or abused the confidence which his constituents reposed in him—that Mr. Adams never filled one which connected him immediately with the people, the great central fire which distributes warmth and life to our whole system, and that his services were recommended to one party by descent, and to the other by purchase, its value as a political argument may be correctly estimated. The evident distortion of Mr. Johnson's judgment seems to be chronically confirmed by the fact, that Gen. Jackson resigned several of these offices, manifesting a preference for private life, in unison with the taste of Cincinnatus, of Washington, and of all the greatest patriots of the world, and in opposition to that low ambition which cannot exist out of the purlieus of the treasury. The classical reader will remember how the Roman writers celebrate the reluctance with which the *Dictator ab Aratro* left his farm, and the satisfaction with which, crowned with laurels, he retired to it. The same disposition was seen and admired in our beloved Washington. In a letter to a member of Congress, who was persuading him to accept the office of President, then just created, he thus expressed himself: "You are among the small number of those who know my invincible attachment to domestic life, and that my sincere wish is to continue in the enjoyment of it solely, to my final hour. My increasing fondness for agricultural amusements, and my growing love of retirement, augment and confirm my decided predilection for the character of a private citizen." And he concludes—"You will perceive, my dear sir, from what is here observed, that my inclinations will dispose and decide me to remain as I am, unless a clear and insurmountable conviction should be impressed on my mind, that some very disagreeable consequences must, in all human probability, result from the indulgence of my wishes." This letter was written when Washington was in his 57th year, and Jackson was 58 when he made his last and most splendid resignation. This is the temper and these are the habits that render "military chieftains" the defenders of the republic in war, and its guardians in peace; and it is not the least extravagant of Mr. Johnson's paralogisms, that in the same breath he should descant on the dangerous influence of military renown, and reproach its possessor with an obstinate predilection for private life. Mr. Clay and Mr. Adams, it is true, have never yet offered to the world that best and most lovely evidence of merit, which modesty displays; they have never resigned one office without the prospect of another, and are not likely to impose on their eulogists the task of portraying the grand but quiet virtue of disinterestedness. Yet Washington, the military chieftain, served eight years without giving reason to doubt his wisdom or integrity, while Messrs. Adams and Clay, the diplomatist and

* See page 17, 18.
General Jackson, though no set-fast in office, was eight years Attorney General of the Territory, and six years Judge of the highest court of the State. His resignation of this last station was accepted on the 24th July, 1804, thirteen days after Hamilton was shot by Burr, and a year at least before the appearance of Burr in the Western country, with whom, as a Judge, the secret slanderers under the management of Mr. Johnson, attempt to associate him.

the orator, have effected in less than half that time, a general conviction that they are destitute of both.

But, says Mr. Johnson, General Jackson not only "resigned three, but passed through all these offices, acknowledging his unfitness in two instances, manifestly feeling it in all, and leaving no single act, no trace behind, which stamps his qualifications above mediocrity." Such allegations as these are enough (to use Mr. Johnson's peculiar dialect) "to stamp their author below mediocrity"—as they abound in misstatement and misconstruction. An individual is appointed to one office, and successively promoted to two others, and because he vacates the subordinate ones in order to reach the highest in the series, these acts of resignation are interpreted into a confession of his own unfitness. Did Mr. Clay acknowledge his unfitness for the Speaker's chair, when he resigned it and took office in the cabinet of Mr. Adams? Does a Colonel evince a conscious incapacity when he accepts the commission of General? Gen. Jackson resigned his seat in the House of Representatives to fill a place in the Senate, and this station he resigned with a patriotism and liberality highly honorable to him, to make room for Gen. Daniel Smith, his neighbor and friend—a gentleman whose superior age and scientific attainments gave him peculiar claims to public confidence, and inspired a hope that he would prove a useful accession to the party which was then opposed to the administration of the elder Adams. This disinterested act, which few of the many who can make long speeches would be capable of, is urged in the address as further proof of incapacity, and the formidable array of evidence to that point, is completed by the assertion that "no trace," that is, no speech is left behind him in his civil career, placing him above mediocrity. But before the conclusion here designed can be admitted, it must be ascertained whether a long speech in Congress, is not in nine cases out of ten, at least, a proof of mediocrity.* A member of Congress, who, without the possession of rare oratorical powers, makes long speeches, is known to have given full exertion to his abilities, and has no claim to a reputation higher than that which is acquired by a large portion of his comrades. Whereas a silent member is regarded as possessed of such strength of mind and dignity of taste, as to disdain the slender repute which one or more speeches create, and is, for that very reason, considered far above mediocrity. When Patrick Henry was asked "who he thought the greatest man" in the famous Congress of '74, from which he was just returned, he replied—"If you speak of eloquence, Mr. Rutledge of South-Carolina, is by far the greatest orator; but if you speak of solid judgment and sound information, Col. Washington is unquestionably the greatest man on that floor."† Yet Washington "passed through and resigned" this and other civil offices, without leaving "a trace" behind, which in the accurate style and estimation of Mr. Johnson, "stamped his qualifications above mediocrity." It is rather unfortunate for one who undertakes to instruct the people of Virginia, that his most oracular opinions should conflict with the dictates of common sense, the judgment of Patrick Henry, and the example of Washington.

The temper of Gen. Jackson is said to be as unsuitable as his capacity, and "the spirit of domination displayed in his celebrated letter to Gov. Rabun," is referred to as evidence that the office of President should not be intrusted to his "impetuosity of temper" and "fiery misrule." In a deep prophetic tone it is added, a foreign war may come, may rage with violence, and may find General Jackson at the head of the civil government, and commander in chief of the land and naval forces. Dissentient views among the statesmen may arise—controversies grow up between the State and Federal authorities—as discussions and controversies have heretofore arisen—and who then, we pray you, can answer for the consequences of that spirit which said to Gov. Rabun, "when I am in the field you have no authority to issue a military order." It may be thought singular that Mr. Johnson, after having so bitterly reviled and lamented the unfairness of tearing "from their context" the expressions of the President, should, when urging a charge so personal in its nature as this against his rival, and attaching to it, as a consequence, "the dissolution of the Union, and death to the hopes of every free government upon earth," be guilty of this very unfairness himself, with a violence too which cannot be conceived without attending to the following summary of facts:

When General Jackson assumed the direction of the Seminole war, he found General Gaines near Hartford, in Georgia, at the head of the contingent force of that State, which he speedily put into motion. Advancing with his raw force of one thousand men, in the direction of Fort Scott, he passed on rude rafts and scarce practicable routes, the fenny swamps and flooded rivers of that region, impelled by the energy of his character and the hope of finding the supplies which had been ordered there, at Fort Early. But when he reached that place, the danger of famine was not abated, there being only a barrel and a half of flour and a few bushels of corn in the Fort. In the neighborhood lived a small tribe of Indians the Chehaws, whose friendship, though doubted, now proved sincere. To these sons of the forest, in his extremity, he applied, desiring them to bring in such supplies of corn, peas and potatoes as they could spare, and promising liberal pay for them. They immediately brought a small supply, and on the General's encamping near their village, which lay directly in his route to Fort Scott, their aged Chief, Howard, the survivor of many wars with the kings of the forest and the foes of his tribe, received him as a brother, and the simple-hearted community emptied almost to exhaustion, to relieve the wants of their guests, the small stock of food which had been collected for their subsistence through the winter. Enthusiasm succeeding their kindness—the few warriors of the village joined the American standard, and it was only in compliance with Jackson's request, that the grandson of Howard, a youth of eighteen, was left to assist that patriarch of the woods, in attending to the old men, women and children. Thus, confiding in the honor of General Jackson, and in the faith of the United States, the

* Frank Johnson made a speech five days long.
† Wirt's life of Henry, page 113.

Chehaw villagers were left in complete exposure. But what had they to apprehend, or what had General Jackson to apprehend for them? To the commanding officer of the small garrison left at Fort Early, he had given instruction to consider the Chehaws as friends, and there was no power behind him that could be dangerous to the allies of the United States. Having clasped the right hand of Howard in friendship, marshalled the warriors of the tribe, and assured the women of peace and protection, who, with their "young barbarians," witnessed his departure, he hastened onward to the theatre of war.

Where the lion walks harmless, the wolf prowls most ferociously. A Captain Wright, of the Georgia militia, upon some false information, conceived and communicated to the Governor, the impression, that after the march of General Jackson from the vicinity of Hartford, hostilities had been committed on that section of the frontier by the Phillimees and Oponees—subordinate or rather incorporated septs of the Chehaw tribe. The Governor, on this erroneous representation, issued a very inconsiderate order, empowering the Captain to march at the head of two companies of cavalry, and such infantry as could be drawn from the garrison of Fort Early, against the supposed aggressors. It was in vain that the commanding officer there assured Captain Wright of the friendship and innocence of the Chehaws, and informed him of their recent aid and hospitality to Gen. Jackson. But why prolong the dreadful recital! The Governor's party had the power and the will to destroy. They burst like a tempest on the devoted village. Helpless age and unresisting infancy they confounded in one torrent of destruction. The bayonet, red with the blood of the infant, was plunged into the breast of the mother. The aged Howard, supported by his grand-son, advanced with a white flag, and was shot with that emblem of faith and peace in his feeble hand. The same cruel volley despatched his grand-son—the village was given to the flames—the women and children to the edge of the sword, or they fled from instant slaughter, in terror and exile, to famine. Wider scenes of desolation have indeed been spread on the face of the globe, when Hyder descended like a thundercloud from the mountains of Mysore, upon the plains of the Carnatic—or when Turreau left La Vendee shrouded in solitude and ashes. But a deeper stain of dishonor, or a more intense visitation of wo, was never seen or inflicted, than at the secluded village of the Chehaws. The massacre of Wyoming was mercy to it, and the revenge of Brandt far less cruel than this amity of the United States. It violated at one blow, humanity, friendship, and the faith of treaties—the obligations of justice, gratitude and honor—and involved in its consequences the disgrace of the nation, the murder of our citizens, and the probable renewal of the war, which was then almost concluded. Against this shameful outrage, the heart of Jackson arose, and he resented it with indignation, but not without dignity: complaining to the executive of the United States and remonstrating with that of Georgia. To the former he says, (7th May 1818,) "The outrage which has been committed on the superannuated warriors, women and children of the Chehaws, whose sons were then in the field, in the service of the U. States, merits the severest chastisement. The interference, too, of the Governor of Georgia, with the duties imposed on me, claims the early attention of the President. All the effects of my campaign may by this one act be destroyed, and the same scenes of massacre and murder with which our frontier settlements have been visited, again repeated."* To the latter, (7 May) after referring to the massacre as "base and cowardly," and to an enclosed copy of General Glascock's letter detailing it, he observes, "That a Governor of a State should make war against an Indian tribe at perfect peace with and under

*General Jackson was informed of this calamity by a letter from General Glascock, dated the 30th April 1818, written at Fort Early, on his return to Georgia, with the contingent of that State. The following is an extract: "On arriving within thirty miles of the Chehaw village, I sent on Major Robinson, with a detachment of twenty men, to procure beef. On his arriving there, the Indians had fled in every direction, the Chehaw town having been consumed about four days before, by a party of men, consisting of 230, under Captain Wright, now in command at Hartford. It appears that after he assumed the command of that place, he obtained the certificates of several men on the frontier, that the Chehaw Indians were engaged in a skirmish on the Big Bend. He immediately sent or went to the Governor, and obtained orders to destroy the towns of Phillemee and Oponee. Two companies of cavalry were immediately ordered out and placed under his command, and on the 22d he reached this place. He ordered Capt. Bothwell to furnish him with twenty-five or thirty men to accompany him; having been authorized to do so by the Governor, the order was complied with. Captain Bothwell told him that he could not accompany him himself; disapproved the plan, and informed Captain Wright that there could be no doubt of the friendship of the Indians in that quarter, and stated that Oponee had, on that day, brought in a public horse that had been lost. This availed nothing, mock patriotism burned in their breasts; they crossed the river that night, and pushed for the town. When arriving near there, an Indian was discovered grazing some cattle; he was made a prisoner. I am informed, by Sergeant Jones, that the Indian proposed to go with the interpreter and brisg one of the Chiefs, for the Captain to talk with. It was not attended to—an advance was ordered—the cavalry pushed forward and commenced the massacre. Even after the firing and murder commenced, Major Howard, an old Chief, who furnished you with considerable corn, came out from his house with a white flag. It was not respected; an order for a general fire was given, and nearly four hundred guns were discharged at him before it took effect. He fell and was bayonetted. His son (grand-son) was also killed." After continuing such horrid details as above, General Glascock adds: "Since then, three of my command, who were left at Fort Scott, obtained a furlough, and on their way to this place one of them was shot." So that the outrage produced by the order of the Governor of Georgia, was already being retaliated on his fellow citizens

the protection of the United States, is assuming a responsibility that I trust you will be able to excuse to the United States, to which you will have to answer;" and he adds, "you, as Governor of a State within my military division, have no right to give a military order when I am in the field." This last is the phrase which Mr. Johnson has "torn from its context," and repeated with an aggravating abbreviation, and in alarming italics. "*When I am in the field you have no right to issue a military order.*" Now, although the negation may at first appear too general, yet the context plainly limits it to the *field* of command on which Jackson was then employed. It obviously was not his intention to say that the Governor had no right to regulate the militia concerns of his State, or to order out quotas in the service of the United States; but that he had no right, as Governor of Georgia, to interfere with his duties, by operations extraneous to the sovereignty of the State, and hostile to the Indians at peace with and under the protection of the United States. In this he was perfectly right, and evinced a disposition to preserve rather than to disturb the harmony so desirable between the States and the general government. The power of making war is vested exclusively by the constitution in the federal government, and the equivalent duty imposed on it of guaranteeing the integrity and independence of the several States. This duty, the federal government was then in the act of discharging in favor of the State of Georgia; and yet, according to Mr. Johnson, the Governor of Georgia was to interrupt its military operations, and to murder its friends and allies, without the voice of remonstrance or admonition. Let us suppose, for a moment, that after General Brown had concluded a friendly agreement with the Buffalo Indians, and with their supplies of provisions and men, had invaded Canada, Governor Tompkins had come on his track, burnt the friendly village, and destroyed or dispersed its inhabitants. Would it have been an unpardonable offence in General Brown to remonstrate against that outrage, and to inform Governor Tompkins that he had transcended his authority? Would it have displayed a "dangerous spirit of domination," or an honorable feeling of justice and humanity? And would it have exposed Gen. Brown to the suspicion and execration of his fellow citizens, or entitled him to their approbation and support? Mr. Johnson's acquaintance with history will remind him that the taking of Saguntum, while in alliance with the Romans, was the immediate cause of the second Punic war, and that the destruction of that city excited a dignified resentment in the Roman people, which defeat after defeat, and slaughter after slaughter, could not subdue, and gave a moral interest as well as a political force to the vengeful expression of the elder Cato, "delenda est Carthago." Not to mention other examples of feeling repugnant to the sentiments with which Mr. Johnson contemplates the sensibility of General Jackson for the fate of the Chehaws, the pride which on a late occasion England took in stretching forth her power as an ægis over her "ancient ally," may be cited —when Mr. Canning, as the organ of his country, declared to the nations in a tone of generous defiance, *that when the march of foreign conquest touched the frontiers of Portugal, it must stay its haughty step.* Yet, while we admire the spirit of the Roman people and of the English statesman, we are persuaded to believe, by Mr. Johnson and his star chamber judges, that when our own patriot protested against an outrage on humanity, a violation of faith, and a usurpation of authority, acquiescence in which would have stained with disgrace our common sense, our common nature, and our common country, he displayed a "fiery misrule of temper," and "a dangerous spirit of domination."

It may, perhaps, be within the extensive circle of his sophistry to contend that the Governor of Georgia, as the head of a sovereign State, had a right to make war on the Indians, the right of war being an incident inseparable from sovereignty. Waiving the constitutional pact between the States and the federal government, and the laws of Congress placing the Indian tribes under the control and keeping of the United States, which would at once defeat this course of argument, it will be enough to observe, that even if the Governor had the right of waging this war, he was bound to prosecute it according to the law of nations and the usages of war. These would have rendered it his duty to ascertain first, whether the injury he complained of was really committed by the Chehaws—and if it were, secondly, whether the authorities of that tribe would make, or refuse proper reparation. This is the practice of all civilized states—is that of the United States —and was exemplified in the late disturbance with the Winnebagoes. So that, conceding the right of war to the Governor, his violation of the laws and usages of war to the injury of the Chehaws, justly exposed him to the remonstrances of Gen. Jackson, who, as an officer of the United States, the guest of the venerable Howard, and the commander of the Chehaw warriors, was in strict alliance with that tribe, and bound to protect it. The fact is, that the Governor of Georgia, was for a time, so infatuated, as to consider his official dignity invaded, and his power encroached upon by this remonstrance of the General, and under that impression wrote a letter to him, reminding him of Georgia's "bleeding frontier," and taunting him with affecting "a military despotism." The fact is too, that this, his letter, made its gasconading appearance in a Georgia Journal, before it was received by the General, and fell into disreputable oblivion soon after. And the probability is, that Mr. Johnson, who though prodigal in charges, is penurious in proofs, has been guided to this buried slander by a sense for defamation as keen and creditable as that which leads certain winged *gnosties* to the carcasses of the dead. But it has as little truth as fragrance. For from the time the Georgia Brigade encamped on the Cahoulgee, and under the conduct of Gen. Jackson, marched by the way of Fort Early to Fort Scott, up to the close of the war, the southern frontier of that State could neither have bled nor been exposed.—A thousand men either stationed on that frontier, or penetrating from it into the Indian country, naturally bore off any thing like hostility; and accordingly General Jackson met with no opposition until he reached the Mickasuky towns, at least 150 miles south of Hartford. Besides the Tennes-

see contingent, consisting also of 1000 men, had marched on the 14th of Feb. from Fayetteville in Tennessee, under the command of Colonel Hayne, of the United States Army, and after reaching Fort Mitchell, on their way to join General Jackson at Fort Scott, had from information that their rations which had given out could not be replenished in the direction of Fort Scott, filed off to the left, and by a route nearly parallel to the advance of Jackson, had passed into Georgia, at Hartford; where Col. Hayne with 400 men remained for the protection of that frontier, until after the period at which Governor Rabun represented it to be "bleeding."* There could therefore have been no real cause, as there was no possible justification, for the attack on the Chehaws; and of this the Governor himself was soon sensible, for in a letter of the 11th May, from Milledgeville, General Glascock says to Gen. Jackson—"I had an interview with the agent and the Governor, and they have concluded that a talk will immediately be held with the chiefs of that place—ascertain the amount of property destroyed, and make ample reparation for the same. This is at once acknowledging the impropriety of the attack, and not in the least degree throwing off the stigma that will be attached to the State."

The next charge is headed with the following important dictum, "Military men should never be allowed to forget that the obligation to obey, being the sole foundation of the authority to command, they should inculcate subordination, not by precept only, but by example." And it is alleged that in defiance of it, General Jackson has committed a threefold offence. "He has offered indignity to the Secretary of War, in the very letter assigning his reasons for disobeying the order to disband his troops—he has placed his own authority in opposition to that of the War Department, by a general order forbidding the officers of his command to obey the orders of the Department, unless they passed through the channel which he had chosen to prescribe—and he disobeyed the order of the Government in his military operations in the Spanish Territory." Sweeping charges are almost always unfounded, because, in order to make them plausible, it is necessary to suppress the very circumstances which qualify the actions they inculcate. In the precise tone of Mr. Johnson, an English essayist might say that the Congress of '76 *offered an indignity to the King of Great Britain, in the declaration of independence assigning their reasons for disobeying his authority.* Every case of the kind is characterized only by its circumstances; and when an expert disputant, trained to the tricks of the forum, advances a charge and omits the circumstances explanatory of its foundation, it is strong evidence that he is himself conscious of its injustice. Now it turns out that the alleged disobedience of Gen. Jackson was justified by the circumstances of the case, was approved by the government, and sanctioned by events. Under the acts authorizing the President to accept the services of 50,000 volunteers, General Jackson, then commanding the 2d division of that militia which he soon rendered so famous—tendered to the Government of the United States the services of himself and two thousand five hundred men of his division, and the tender was accepted. The detachment having been embodied and organized, was ordered to proceed by water to New-Orleans. Subsequently to his departure, General Jackson was advised to halt near Natchez, and in compliance with it, he took a position in the neighborhood of that city. Here while attending to the health and discipline of the corps, he received the laconic mandate from the War Department, with disobedience to which he is so grievously reproached. It is first to be noticed, that as all men have some degree of fallibility and some degree of discretion, and as the imperfections of language and the interposition of distance, give ample scope for the operation of both, it may well happen that the non-execution of an order is the best possible mode of obeying the Government. When an officer receives an order, which the exercise of a sound discretion convinces him would not have been issued had the condition of the circumstances in which it was to operate been known to the authority from which it proceeded, the spirit of his duty comes in direct opposition to the letter of his order. Obedience in such a case, consists not in a blind submission to the words, but in a zealous fulfilment of the intentions of the Government. The order of the Emperor, it is true, authorized Grouchy to continue his unprofitable contest with the Prussians, but the spirit of his duty required his presence and exertions at Waterloo. By disregarding the signal which recalled him from fight, Lord Nelson fulfilled the wishes of his Government, shook the throne of Denmark, and shattered the confederacy of northern powers. So obvious is the distinction between nominal and real obedience, that it could not have escaped the attention of Mr. Johnson, but for the loyal amazement with which he is affected at the idea of indignity to the head of a department. This seems to overcome all his better faculties, and to leave him nothing but the powers of genuflection and obloquy. He forgets that an order may be obscure, and therefore liable to misconstruction, and that it may contain imperfections of date or expression which bring into doubt its genuineness. In the case now considered, all these causes operated against a strict execution of the order. Gen. Jackson could not be easily convinced that it was the intention of the President, after accepting the services of his volunteers, and removing them six hundred miles from their homes in an inclement season, pregnant with disease, and beyond a vast wilderness filled with hostility, to deprive them of food to save them from hunger—to strip them of tents to cover them from the weather, and of arms to defend them from savages. Yet, on the 15th March, he received the duplicate of an order addressed to him at New-Orleans, requiring him, "on its receipt, to consider his corps dismissed from public service," and to "deliver over to Gen. Wilkinson all articles of public property which may have been put into its possession"—not leaving the men a mouthful of

* See the despatch of Gen. Jackson to the War Department of the 25th March, from Fort Gadsden, three weeks before the massacre of the Chehaws, and also his letter of the 11th of August to Gov. Rabun.

tood—in the hands of the detachment a musket or cartridge—in the possession of the corps a single tent or wagon, or the smallest accommodation for their sick, of whom there were more than 150. He received another copy of the same order, which was dated near a month earlier, (before General Armstrong, whose signature it bore, had come into the war department,) and containing variations of expression which made it appear not to be an exact copy. However, he determined to obey it with as much exactness and as little delay as possible. He saw, what Mr. Johnson does not perceive, that its declaratory part effected itself. He and his detachment were dismissed the service of the United States. The order was not a direction to disband, but a notification of dismissal, so far effected itself, and required in no degree the agency of Gen Jackson. This Mr. Johnson may assure himself of by conceiving that Gen. Jackson, or any other General, were directed *to consider himself and his corps engaged with the enemy*, and reflecting whether that would be deemed an order for attack. Its mandatory clause, relating to public property, and admitting of some exceptions, he conceived it his duty, both to the government and to his men, not to carry into full execution. Viewing ours as a just and paternal government, he considered his detachment pretty much as the law considers a pretermitted child, and determined to do that for his men which the government had, it appeared, forgotten to do. In a letter to the Governor of Tennessee, under whose authority the order of the Secretary had replaced him, he says, "I have, however, from the necessity of the case, determined to keep some of the tents, and to march the men back in as good order as possible, and I will make every sacrifice to add to their comfort. I have, required of the contractor here twenty days rations, which will take my men to Colbert's; and I must trust in Providence and your exertions to furnish them with supplies from there to Nashville." To Gen. Wilkinson, who had enclosed the order, he says: "I have had the honor of receiving your letter of the 8th inst. with its enclosures, containing directions for me to deliver over the public property to you, which is in the possession of my detachment. The order will be complied with, except a small reservation of tents for the sick, and some other indispensable articles. I acknowledge the order was unexpected; but I coincide with you in sentiment, that those who are bound must obey." Let the reader recollect that the law under which the services of this corps had been accepted, made the arms and accoutrements of the soldier his private property at his discharge—operating like a bounty on enlistments—that of course Gen. Jackson had no right to apply it to this species of military property, and that he only suspended its execution so far as to retain a few tents and other articles indispensable to the care of the sick, until he could get his corps through the wilderness, which was already the scene of those Indian murders that soon brought on the Creek War—that to effect this patriotic and honorable purpose he borrowed 5000 dollars on his own private account*—and that the government itself sanctioned his proceedings, and then determine the degree of credit to which Mr. Johnson's charge is entitled. Let it be also remembered that this chivalric corps contained the Coffees and the Carrols, who fought wherever they could find a foe, and the Lauderdales and the Donelsons, who fell with so much glory: and that had Gen Jackson, through fear of "indignity," *disbanded* his troops and left them uncovered, unfed, undefended victims to disease, to want, and to murder, the patriots of Tennessee would have been justly disgusted with a service, which, when inspired with gratitude and affection for their faithful leader, they adhered to with such signal zeal and triumphant efficiency.

It appears, then, that so far from deserving censure for the modified execution of the order in question, he merits the praise of prudence and generosity; and is entitled to the gratitude of his country for that seasonable and enlightened independence which had the effect of attaching to him and to her the materials of future safety and honor. As to the *indignity* offered to the Secretary of War, at which our modern Macsycophant is so bustling and *booing*, it is probable that the Secretary, who was by no means dull of apprehension, did not perceive it. But if he did, he could only consider it a private injury, as, by his own act, General Jackson was no longer under his authority; and was, therefore, out of the rule of obedience upon which Mr. Johnson founds the right to command. His letter, after representing the discrepancy between the date of the order, (5th Jan.) and the official notification of Gen. Armstrong's entrance into the War Department, (3d Feb.) assures the Secretary of his determination "to obey the order, and to deliver over to the quarter-master of the department all public property in my hands, that can be spared from the convenience and health of my men, on their return to Nashville; it being the place at which they were rendezvoused by the orders of the President of the United States, and to which place I shall march them as soon as the necessary supplies can be had for the purpose." He then expatiates on the loss of public spirit and of patriotic lives, and on the great distress which would attend the immediate dispersion of his men—expresses his conviction that their arms belonged to them, and his surprise that an order so neglectful of their feelings and interests, should have been traced by the hand "of an old revolutionary soldier, who knows the privations of a soldier's life, who exercised his talents (not at a very prudent moment) in their behalf, at the close of the last war." Now this, so far from offering an indignity, really conveyed a delicate allusion to the Newburg letters. Gen. Armstrong had not the folly to consider it an indignity, and, Gen. Jackson being out of service, not the right to consider it an offence. He was no doubt gratified at his prudence in not putting that interpretation on his laconic order, which might have been a natural one in situations so safe, near, and plentiful as Niagara and Norfolk, but which would have been incalculably distressing to the Tennesseeans at Natchez. When it is taken into consideration too, that the tender of this corps had been accepted in August, that they had been assembled in December, had

* Of a merchant of Natchez.

embarked on the Cumberland in January—that after voyaging, often through floating ice and stormy weather, more than 1000 miles, they had encamped near Natchez on the 21st Feb. and had then been dismissed without ceremony or accommodation, on the 15th March—the reader will be apt to conclude that more moderation on the part of Jackson, would have been mean spirited, would have betrayed a want of that sensibility to the claims of friendship, and neighborhood, and fellowship, which he so heroically felt—which did him so much honor as a man, and were so fortunate in the event to his country.

The winding course of Mr. Johnson's defamation, brings next into view the charge of disobedience to the War Department, in the shape of "a general order;" and if a man can lose reputation by making unjust attacks upon the fame of another, it will tend as little to his honor as those which have already been refuted. The circumstances explaining this case are the following: while Gen. Jackson was in the service of the United States, it occurred several times, and at seasons of the greatest pressure, that officers to whom he had assigned important duties, were silently withdrawn from their posts by orders from some subaltern in the line, stationed as a deputy in the adjutant and inspector general's office, at Washington. On the 1st of October, 1814, for example, just a fortnight after the first attack on Fort Bowyer, and while the whole British armament was hovering between Mobile and New Orleans,* an order was issued from the war department signed John R. Bell, deputy inspector general, directing Col. Sparks, and the officers of the 2d regiment, including the gallant Major Lawrence, to proceed forthwith on the recruiting service! This order was received while Gen. Jackson was effecting the timely expulsion of the British from Pensacola, and had left Mobile in charge of Col. Sparks, and Fort Bowyer in that of Major Lawrence. With commendable prudence these officers declined obedience, and remained at their posts. General Jackson complained of it to the government, pointed out the serious consequences that might have been produced by it, and suggested the propriety of communicating in future all orders to his subordinates through him, inasmuch as his capacity to defend the extensive and defenceless line of territory committed to his charge, would be destroyed, if the officers on whose vigilance and exertions he depended were removed from their stations without his knowledge.

This representation received no effectual attention from the government—and the anomalous practice it condemned, continued at intervals to prevail. A forcible instance occurred in the person of Major Long, who, having reported himself under a regular order to Gen. Jackson for duty, was directed by him to the upper Mississippi, for the purpose of sketching the topography of a district in that quarter, upon which a contest with the Indians was then apprehended. The next thing the General heard of his Engineer, was, while he was anxiously expecting his report, through a newspaper notice in New York, that the Major had some time since established himself in that city, in obedience to an order from the War Department. Gen. Jackson (4th March, 1817) again appealed to Mr. Monroe (then President) on the subject, reiterated his former reasons against the irregularity, and deprecated with much earnestness its prevalence in his division, when no emergencies of war existed to require it, and when his head-quarters were at Nashville, a point of convenient distribution for orders directed by mail to the various military stations in the south and west. This communication, like the former, proving ineffectual, determined no longer to have more responsibility than power, he took measures to bring the subject before the government in a way that would admit of no further neglect. On the 22d April he issued a general order forbidding the officers of his division to obey any order from the War Department which did not pass through the office of his Adjutant General. About two months after this, the President still declining any decision on the matter, and suffering it to fester by delay, an order was issued from the War Department, to General Ripley, then in command at New Orleans, which in compliance with Jackson's General Order, he did not obey. Finding one of his officers involved in difficulty by an act of military subordination and fidelity, Jackson immediately assumed an attitude which none but a Martinet or an attorney can fail to admire. In a letter to the President, (12th Aug. 1817,) he referred to his former communications on this subject, and to the cases which had produced them—repeated the substance of his general order, and stated the dilemma of General Ripley, and with his characteristic spirit and honor thus relieved him from all responsibility: "This has given rise to the proper disobedience of Maj. Gen. Ripley to the order of the Department of War above alluded to, for which I hold myself responsible." He adds—"In the view I took of this subject on the 4th of March, I had flattered myself you would coincide, and had hoped to receive your answer before a recurrence of a similar infringement of military rule rendered it necessary for me to call your attention thereto. None are infallible in their opinions; but it is nevertheless necessary, that all should act agreeably to their convictions of right. My convictions in favor of the course I have pursued are strong, and should it become necessary, I will willingly meet a fair investigation before a military tribunal. The good of the service, and the dignity of the commission I hold, alone actuate me. My wishes for retirement have already been made known to you, but under existing circumstances, my duty to the officers of my division forbids it, until this subject is fairly understood." The final decision, when it came, was that orders to inferiors should pass through the commanding officer of the division, always thereafter, *unless in case of necessity*. Admitting the principle contended for by Jackson, and terminating a practice, which, under the aspect of legal authority, was subversive of discipline, injurious to service, and repugnant to justice. It is true that by the constitution, the President is Commander in Chief of the army, and that by a custom almost equivalent to law, the orders of the Secretary are considered the orders of the Presi-

* See despatch from Mr. Monroe to Gen. J. of the 27th Sept. and from Gen. J. to Mr. M. of the 24th and 27th Aug.

dent, and that among the illegitimate descendants of this custom, was the practice of confiding the power of the Department to Lieutenants of the line, whose enormous deviations from propriety, as in the order to Col. Sparks, brought it into question and disrepute. But the President is Commander in Chief, only in the same sense in which the General is commander of his division; has no stronger claim to the obedience of the General than the latter has to the obedience of the Colonel; and his orders, whether issued under his sign manual, or through the Secretary of War, or the imposing instrumentality of a subaltern, are to be restrained by the laws of Congress and the principles of the constitution. No man will contend that his authority in the army is absolute—that he can of his own accord inflict capital punishment on a soldier—can make a lieutenant command a captain, a colonel a general, or exact duty from either without allowing him his proper rank. Now the essence of rank consists in the superiority of command which it confers; and any order of the President making an inferior disobey the orders of his superior, is a derogation of the rank of that superior, and produces a disorder, the removal of which necessarily exposes to disturbance in a similar and equivalent degree, the authority of the President over the superior. The order to Col. Sparks required a direct and violent disobedience to Gen. Jackson's command, as that to Major Long effected it. To have rendered these orders entirely legal and expedient, they should have been communicated through the commanding General. They would then have preserved the just equality between responsibility and power, which the nature of delegated authority requires. And instead of causing one act of obedience, and one of disobedience, they would have produced two acts of perfect obedience, through agents related in due subordination to each other. The course pursued by the government, moreover, involved the signal injustice of fixing *publicly* the proportion between Gen. Jackson's power and responsibility, upon which proportion, it must be presumed, he consented to assume the latter, and then *privately*, and without his knowledge, reducing the former below that proportion, by a proceeding much in the nature of an *ex post facto* law. The silence and hesitation persevered in respecting his remonstrances, while they tended to produce an impression that the reasons he advanced were not disapproved, created a strong demand for the decisive measures he adopted, and the fact which is but too apparent that the irregularity he complained of, was calculated, if continued, to disappoint the department, as well as the General, as it might be retorted by the latter in various perplexing ways, furnishes another strong objection to it. Its only excuse is a complete justification of it, where it can be shown, and a marked condemnation of it, where it cannot be shown; viz: *necessity*. To this fair adjustment and full redress, Gen. Jackson brought this abuse in the service, and for the spirit and judgment he displayed on that occasion alone, he deserves the gratitude of the army, and the respect of his fellow citizens.

Having in a former number shown to your readers that his military operations in Florida were in direct obedience to the orders of the War Department, I shall not be detained by Mr. Johnson's repetition of that unfounded charge, further than to advert to the clumsy dexterity with which he shifts his ground—at one moment inveighing against the General, for disobedience to the orders of the Department, and at the next reviling him for conduct in direct obedience to them. From this dilemma he cannot escape, unless he can prove that the orders vesting Gen. Jackson "with full powers to conduct the war in the manner he might think best"—authorizing him "to march across the Florida line, and attack the Seminoles within its limits"—and requiring him to collect a force sufficient "to beat the enemy and terminate the conflict," did not justify his invasion of Florida, within the limits of which "the enemy" was situated; or his temporary occupation of the Spanish Posts, of which, in defiance of the stipulations of a treaty and the duties of a neutral, the Seminoles held either hostile control or military possession. A disposition to avoid labor and repetition, suggests the propriety of a similar reference for a refutation of the charges grounded upon the *miscalled declaration of martial law*—an act of vigor and forecast, which in its origin and consequences was vindicated by urgent necessity, justified by powerful analogies, sanctioned by examples, and ratified by events; covering that city with glory and protection, endearing its performer to all who were willing to fight in its defence, and thrilling every patriotic heart in this Union with emotions of joy and triumph.

These offences against the law and the Constitution being disposed of, we come to those with which Mr. Johnson declares "mercy and humanity unite in accusing General Jackson." They stand in his catalogue in the following order:—"The cold-blooded massacre at the Horse-Shoe"—"the decoyed and slaughtered Indians at St. Marks"—"the wanton and unexampled execution of Ambrister"—"and of the still more injured Arbuthnot, a trader and an advocate for peace." With respect to "the cold blooded massacre at the Horse-Shoe," as no order for one was ever given by Gen. Jackson, it is a calumny on the courage and humanity of his officers and men, who have added unfading laurels to those which they gained on that desperate day—many of whom, in their unrivalled campaigns, found honorable wounds or glorious death—and some of whom have filled and occupy the highest stations in the esteem and government of a grateful country. My business is confined to the correction of the more intentional injustice of the address, and therefore, after assuring the reader that there is no foundation whatever in truth or in history for such a charge, I shall do no more than submit this inexcusable misrepresentation to that sort of destruction which the testimony of a witness undergoes, when it is proved, that in order to establish a certain point of interest, he has made solemn declarations, which had no foundation in fact, and could have none in his own knowledge. Gen. Carroll, the late Governor of Tennessee, and a distinguished disciple of Gen. Jackson in war, whose rank and presence in this action gave him a minute acquaintance with its features, upon reading Mr. Johnson's address, furnished

the following statement:—"I have seen the address of the anti-Jackson Convention of Virginia, in which Gen. Jackson is charged with the cold-blooded massacre of the Indians at the Horse Shoe. During the whole of the Creek war, I served as Inspector General of the Army—was present at the battle of the Horse-Shoe, and can say, of my own personal knowledge, that the charge is wholly destitute of foundation. Towards the close of the action, after the breast-works had been taken by assault, a number of Indians took refuge under a quantity of brush and logs. Gen. Jackson advanced to within a short distance of the place of their concealment, and directed his interpreter, George Mayfield, to assure them, that if they would surrender, they should be treated with the greatest humanity. They answered the proposition by firing upon and wounding Mayfield severely in the shoulder. A similar proposition was also made by Jim Fife, or old Chinnebee, and the fire of the Indians was the only reply it received. After a number of our men were killed and wounded by those Indians, and after they had twice refused to surrender upon any terms, the brush was set on fire, and but few of them escaped death. The prisoners taken on that day, including a large number of women and children, were humanely treated by Gen. Jackson. I have made the above statement in justice to Gen. Jackson, and the brave men who fought the battle of the Horse Shoe."*

The testimony of numerous eye-witnesses might be added to this statement, but no multiplication of certificates could render it more respectable, or more completely effect the explosion of this "cold-blooded" slander. The reader must be struck with the emphatic, yet forbearing tone in which it is expressed, proving that although the writer was sensible of the injustice of Mr. Johnson's reflection on himself, he was not at all moved by it.

But perhaps it is intended to impress the public mind with the belief, that dislodging those desperate Indians who rejected quarter and prolonged the battle after resistance was vain, was of itself a "cold-blooded massacre." Are then the enemies of the U. States, when waging a savage unsparing war, to requite with wounds and death our offers of humanity and protection, and yet be saved from death or retaliation? Are our commanders to begin an action—overpower by great efforts the main force of the enemy, and then abandon the field and the victory to a few desperadoes? General Jackson's duty to his country and his government, compelled him, if in his power, to defeat the enemy; and that operation necessarily involves the destruction of every adversary who refuses to yield. Had the desperate party at the Horse Shoe, been a detachment of Bonaparte's Imperial Guard, the veterans of fifty pitched battles, and commanded by Ney or Soult, they must have suffered the fate of the Indians—as a garrison which refuses a summons, may, by the laws of war, be blown into the air. But who were these determined and deluded savages? The same who, when the sudden hostility of their nation rose like an inundation on the settlements of Alabama, herding hundreds of women and children into Fort Mimms, broke into that asylum with treachery, fire and murder; who followed to that feast of butchery, where quarter was neither offered nor allowed, the volcanic voice of Weatherford; and as it rose above the shouts of fury and the shrieks of despair, breathing inextinguishable rage and demanding relentless slaughter, obeyed its ferocious summons, until but 17 out of 300 of our unarmed citizens were left alive. They were the same men who, under cover of a truce granted for their benefit by Gen. Jackson, had entrapped and slaughtered the son of Chinnibee—the Massanissa of the Creeks—the friend and ally of the American people.* These are the beings, whose self-provoked destruction, in a fair and hard-fought action,† the people of Virginia

* Ramsay's History, continued, published in 1818, gives an account similar to this of General Carroll, v. 3, p. 16?.

* Chinnibee was chief of the Natchez tribe. A few days before the battle of the Horse Shoe, a party of the hostile Creeks communicated to him their wish to submit to General Jackson, and join the friendly Creeks. For this purpose Chinnibee interceded, and pledged himself as a hostage for their fidelity. They accordingly came into his fort, where they were received as friends. In the course of a few days, they mentioned that they had corn and some other provisions secreted in the neighboring hills, and asked for permission and assistance to convey it to the fort. Chinnibee furnished them his horses, and sent with them his youngest son. After getting about fifteen miles from the fort they turned upon young Chinnibee, and murdered him with the indecency and cruelty peculiar to savages—carried off the horses—joined the hostile Creeks, and were engaged in the battle. To the honor of the noble father of this unfortunate son, it must be added, that after the action had commenced, Capt. Gordon, who commanded the spies, discovered, just as the order for storming the Indian breast-work was about to be given, that the women and children who were within the works, might be saved by the intervention of Chinnibee, and would otherwise be destroyed in a successful assault. He communicated this to General Jackson, who suspended the order, although his men were suffering from the fire of the Indians, both those prepared to make the assault, and those who were swimming the river to support it, and desired old Chinnibee to endeavor to get the women and children to a place of safety. Although his son had been murdered so cruelly, with a humanity truly christian, this old man mounted the breastwork at the hazard of his life, and calling to the women, told them he was ready to save them and their children. They hastened towards him, he sprang into the fort, and the poor creatures clinging to his hunting shirt and clustering around him like a swarm of bees, were brought out of the fort and saved from destruction. The General then gave the order to storm, the works were carried, the enemy destroyed, and the victory gained. Does this look like a cold-blooded massacre? And yet fifty witnesses will confirm it if Mr. Johnson is incredulous.

† The loss of the Americans in this action, was 55 killed and 146 wounded. Among the former were Major Montgomery, of the regular

are advised to consider, in order to vilify a faithful officer, a "cold-blooded massacre!"

The charge "of the decoyed and slaughtered Indians at St. Marks," is next in order and equal in truth. Its subject is indissolubly connected with the crimes and fate of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, and blends itself intimately with the operations of Jackson in Florida. But the scene of these transactions was so remote and obscure—covered by untravelled wildernesses, unmeasured swamps, and undefined jurisdictions—the characters upon which they operated so notorious and yet so unknown, their allegiance so diversified, and their motives so various, that the attention even of a fair inquirer is often bedimmed and confounded in their study, as the strongest eye is mocked in pursuing the everchanging reflection from agitated water. In their present state of indigestion, they form a mass of rubbish, behind which every scribbler who chooses to revile Jackson and hopes to delude the public, entrenches himself. I confess it was with astonishment, something like that which the reader of Tom Jones experiences on finding the philosopher Square meditating on the fitness of things behind Molly Seagrim's blanket, I discovered C. Johnson ensconced within it. And it is less to expose him, than to prevent the leader of any future conventiclers, who may put their heads and their haunches together for the purpose of hatching public misrepresentations, that I invoke the patience of the reader's attention to the following detail:

The *dramatis personæ* engaged in the catastrophe which Jackson is accused of producing, were—Lieut. Colonel Nichols, of the British artillery—Woodbine an English adventurer of fine address and desperate morals, trainer of hostile Indians, with the title if not the rank of Captain,* and in that respect, adjunct and successor of Nichols—Arbuthnot, a Scotchman, who had left his wife in Europe, married a colored one in the West Indies, and with a son by the former one taken a trading position in Florida, got himself elected Chief of the Indians at war with the United States, and as such had sanctioned the butchery of Lieut. Scott and his party—Ambrister, a half officer and half buccaneer, who, with the commission of "auxiliary lieutenant of colonial marines," given by admiral Cochrane during the war with his country, was taken three years after the peace, leading the Indians and fugitive negroes in battle against the troops of the United States. Hambly and Doyle, subjects of Spain, agents of a commercial firm in Pensacola, driving the Indian trade in an establishment on the Apilachicola, and favorers of peace—Cook, clerk to Arbuthnot, also in favor of peace—Francis or Hillis Hadgo, Chief of the prophets of the Creek Nation, appointed by Tecumseh in his insurrectional visit to the Southern tribes in the fall of 1812, an inveterate enemy of the United States, had refused to unite with his countrymen in the capitulation of Fort Jackson, abandoned his country, and at the head of the outlawed Redsticks, had taken refuge and protection with the Seminoles in Florida, instigated them to rapine and murder, and had witnessed and encouraged the massacre of Lieutenant Scott and his party—Hemithlimaco, a Redstick Chief, the principal warrior of the prophet, and principal perpetrator of that massacre.*

The motives and liabilities of these men were as various as their names and nations. The motive of Nichols was success in his profession and service to his country, stained with the design of debasing the chivalry of war, by the employment of savage associates. To this Woodbine added, and in a predominating degree, the infamous desire of plunder and profit. Lucre was the sole object of Arbuthnot, and his means for procuring it were sagacious and unscrupulous—proposing to acquire an influence over all the surrounding Indian tribes, by means of it to disturb their existing relations with their civilized neighbors, both as to territory and trade, and to engross the entire profits of the latter. A mixed and unprincipled thirst for gain and for fame, seems to have actuated Ambrister. Interest, which incited Arbuthnot and Ambrister to produce confusion, made Hambly and Doyle anxious to preserve peace. Cook was engaged to be married to a girl in New Providence, felt therefore an inordinate attachment to life, and little disposition to run the hazards of his employer, Arbuthnot. The "self exiled" Prophet, loving his country less than he hated her enemies, was filled with revenge for the disasters of the Creek war, for the loss of influence which they had occasioned him, for the severities which his refusal to submit to the capitulation† of Fort Jackson had occasioned him, and for the "exemplary punishment" denounced against him by the order of the Secretary of War, (16th Jan. 1818) which was committed for execution to Gen. Jackson. He was further

army, an officer of great promise, and Lieutenants Moulton and Sommerville. Among the latter, the present Generals Carroll and Houston, the late and the present Governors of Tennessee.

*Latour, page 87.

* The *Redsticks* were a powerful tribe of the Creek Indians, whose national standard was a red pole decorated with human scalps,

——————"*Besmeared with blood,*
"*Of human sacrifice, and parent's tears.*"

Their possessions once reached from the Alabama to the Mississippi and one of their principal villages was on the latter river, where Baton Rouge (Red Staff) now stands. The "outlawed Redsticks" were that portion of this tribe who, refusing to abide by the capitulation of Fort Jackson, were *outlawed* by the Creeks.

† The agreement commonly called the *treaty* of Fort Jackson, was, in reality, a *military capitulation*, so designated and prescribed by the government. In a letter from the War Department, of the 20th March, 1814, first addressed to Gen. Pinckney, and then communicated to Gen. Jackson, it is said—"since the date of my last letter, it has occurred to me that the proposed treaty with the Creeks should take a form *altogether military*, and should be in the nature of a *capitulation*." Under this and similar orders, the *capitulation* was concluded. And yet Mr. Clay, in his speech (Jan. 18th, 1819,) on the Seminole war, attaches blame to Gen. Jackson for "the dictatorial terms" of this *treaty*, as he calls it. So that then, as now, if Gen. Jackson executed the orders of the government he was censured, and if he only appeared to transcend them, abused.

stimulated by the pride of character, which a late visit to England, and a flattering reception from the Prince Regent had inspired, and by the hope of reviving the hostile spirit of the Creeks and regaining his former influence and possessions. With a hatred to the United States equally passionate and fierce, Himithmaco was infuriated by a natural thirst for carnage, superstitious reverence for the prophetical dignity of Francis, and habitual eagerness to execute his most brutal purposes.

The agency of these individuals, impelling, moderating or counteracting each other, and deriving more or less encouragement and aid from the Spanish authorities, had kept up a state of hesitating war, but unremitting robbery and bloodshed on our southern frontier, ever since the termination of the Creek war, in August, 1814. In its least offensive but most dangerous form, it was repelled by Gen. Jackson, when he dislodged the British armament from Pensacola, in November of that year. It is the business of history to record how, with more than mother's care, a patriot's fire, and a statesman's foresight, on the first intelligence of its appearance there, he flew unordered to the protection of Mobile, and fortified and garrisoned Fort Bowyer. How, while he awakened by despatches, the vigilance of the cabinet, just composed after the capture of Washington—he roused the patriotism of the people, and calling on Coffee and his volunteers with a voice in which they heard the trump of Fame, he forced the British to abandon Pensacola, and the Spaniards to maintain their neutrality. How, after securing the left flank of his extensive line of defence, penetrable by rivers, and accessible by bays, he passed with incredible expedition to the banks of the Mississippi, with little other aid from the government than, *stale intelligence and diplomatic directions*,* with arms, flints and money, collected by himself, withdraw, unfurnished and inferior forces, he vanquished both in attack and defence, the most formidable veterans of Europe, and surpassed in skill and courtesy, her renowned and accomplished Generals. Since the peace with England these lawless disturbances had been continued by forays of rapine and murder, principally on the southern borders of Georgia, which, after some movements of troops, many *talks* with the Indians, and much diplomacy with Spain, were persevered in until the fall of 1817—murder and military execution were committed on our unsuspecting soldiers and helpless women and children. Public opinion now appealed to the government, and the government to Gen. Jackson. He took the field, and with that unerring aim of judgment and courage, which, like the noble instinct of the mastiff, springs right at the heart, he penetrated and destroyed the sources of this cruel and infamous war, with the utmost possible expedition and the least practicable bloodshed. Without provisions, and with a force of only 1000 raw militia and Indians, to whom too he was a stranger, he entered Florida, built Fort Gadsden, routed the Indians at Micasuky, found in their village near 300 old scalps, and on the prophet's red pole 50 fresh ones, most of them recognised by the hair to have belonged to the unfortunate party of Lieut. Scott. Here, ascertaining from the prisoners that a part of the enemy had fled to St. Marks, and also ascertaining the criminal complicity of the commandant, he formed a determination to prevent any further abuse of Spanish neutrality and American rights, and took possession of that fortress—where he found "the advocate for peace" Arbuthnot, who, with the innocent and [illegible] look peculiar to his countrymen when they meditate shrewd and dangerous designs,' sat an unconcerned guest at the table of the commandant. From St. Marks, discovering that the remnant of the routed Indians and negroes had retreated down the west coast of East Florida, in the direction of Woodbine's grand depot of Virginia and Georgia runaway slaves, he pursued and overtook them near the Econfinnah swamp, where some were killed, many taken, and the only woman who escaped death from the murderers of Lieut. Scott, recaptured. The enemy retreating to the Suwaney were not allowed time to renew their strength or courage, but were again attacked and routed, with such loss and dispersion, that the victors hoped they had finished the war.

On this occasion Ambrister was made prisoner. The army returned to St. Marks, where the General, having received information from the Governor of Alabama, that a large body of

---

* The first intelligence which Gen. Jackson received from the government of the projected attack on New Orleans, was in a letter from Mr. Monroe, (then Secretary of War) of the 7th Sept. 1814. But as early as the 10th Aug. he had despatched by express the same intelligence in a corroborated form to the Department, the receipt of which, and of four other despatches of that month, are acknowledged by Mr. Monroe on the 27th Sept. In the letter of the 7th, Gen. Jackson is emphatically told, "you should repair to New Orleans as soon as your arrangements can be completed in the other parts of the district, *unless your presence should be required at other points.*" In a letter of the 10th December, he is told in a spirit quite prophetical, considering he had no efficient supplies from the Department, that *by taking a suitable position in the vicinity of New Orleans, he will be enabled "to overwhelm the enemy whenever he presents himself,"* and this without the Secretary's having any definite knowledge of Jackson's strength or giving any information of the enemy's. But suppose the enemy had got possession of Mobile, which the same letter describes as of little importance, "comparatively a trifling object with the British government," and which nothing but Jackson's bold expulsion of them from Pensacola, and persevering maintenance, in spite of the order for the officers of the 2d regiment "to go on the recruiting service, [of a garrison at Fort Bowyer,] prevented—their 14,000 men might have been passed up the Tombeckbee, rekindling the Indian war all the way, and in four days march from the highest navigation of that river, have reached the Mississippi at the Chickasaw Bluffs, cutting off New Orleans from supplies and support, ensuring both to themselves, and then New Orleans must have fallen without a blow.

*Junius to Lord Mansfield. Scott, *passim*.

(To be concluded in our next.)

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*,

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, APRIL 12, 1828. No. 5.

hostile Indians who had been committing fresh murders on the Alabama, were assembling near Pensacola, and were there freely admitted and constantly furnished with means of subsistence and war, he determined to cut of this last head of the Hydræ—to supply any defect of will or power that might exist on the part of the Governor to observe his neutrality, and to occupy that place for a time also. Marching by the Ocheesee Bluffs, he was confirmed in his intention by finding the navigation of the Escambia occluded to his supplies. He therefore proceeded, and entering Pensacola on the 24th of May, he took Fort Barrancas on the 27th—having, in his short campaign of three months, and with an undisciplined force, varying from one to two thousand, overrun a country larger than Italy—forced a Parthian enemy three times to action, and though once inferior in numbers, thrice defeated him; without any materials for a military bridge, having passed rivers as large and as deep as the Po or the Adige—without other subsistence frequently than acorns, rawhides and water, having marched more than 800 miles; with scarce any artillery, having taken by force or intimidation three fortresses, and with little more than the energies of his own great mind terminated forever this savage, servile and piratical war. It was a subject of glory to Pompey the Great, that after having worsted Sertorius, he should be chosen to conduct the war against the Pirates. When Gen. Jackson undertook the Seminole War, he had defeated the best troops, and among the finest Generals of Europe, and terminated the most glorious campaign of the age. Yet he is found as ardent and persevering against these hordes of savages and slaves, as sincerely devoted to the country as any young aspirant for fame, little dreaming that in the bosom of that country, ingratitude was to hatch a brood of Vampires!

During these operations, it happened that the Prophet Francis and his instrument Kenhagee, king of the Mississukian, in whose town the 350 scalps were found, had after the murder of Lieut. Scott and his party seized Hambly and Doyle, at the instigation of Arbuthnot, under whose authority as chief, and that of Francis they were tried in council and sentenced to be tortured to death, for their friendship to the United States. From this wretched fate they were rescued by the spirited interference of a negro, *Nero*, the commander of 60 other negroes in the service of the hostile Chief Bowlegs, and were by his agency conveyed, as prisoners of Arbuthnot, and his Indians to St. Marks, for safe keeping. Here they were received by the commandant as prisoners, and here they saw numerous evidences of the participation of the Spanish authorities in the Seminole war, but escaping in a canoe, they were taken up by Lieut. M'Keever, of the United States' Navy, in the adjacent Bay. With a sort of dramatic coincidence, it came to pass that the thirst for blood having risen in the breast of the prophet and his warrior Himithlimaco, they soon repented the rescue of Hambly and Boyle, and came to St. Marks in quest of them, just after they had made their escape. With the ferocious perseverance of wolves they pursued their flight along the coast, hoping that weather or weariness would force them ashore, and soon descried a vessel at anchor, with British colours flying at the mast head.—After some reconnoitering they went aboard, were conducted into the cabin where they found Hambly and Doyle, who immediately identifying them as the murderers of Lieut. Scott and his party, and their own captors and tormentors, they were put in irons by Lieut. M'Keever. These circumstances being all made known to Gen. Jackson, by a mass of proof and undisputed notoriety, in conformity with the order of the Secretary of War "to inflict exemplary punishment on the authors of the atrocities"—committed on Lieut. Scott's party, and Mrs. Garrett's family, he had them hung, in accordance with the principles of the Law of Nations, and in obedience to the dictates of humanity, which their atrocities had outraged, and to which the terror and example of their fate was a just sacrifice, and proved a salutary propitiation.

The reader will see that the only decoying was practiced by Lt. M'Keever and before he can agree to censure that, it must be shown that our naval officers had no right to use such stratagems as the officers of other nations practice, although the colors of all nations are furnished them for this express puopose; and it must be farther shown that it was the duty of General Jackson to see that Lt. M'Keever should dress and manage his ship exactly to the taste of Mr. Johnson. These Indians were taken by stratagem and surprise as Andre was, and like that unfortunate officer, who never violated a feeling of humanity, they were "slaughtered"—that is, they were hung. In this punishment, as justice, humanity, and the law of nations were satisfied, it is to be observed that they being out of the United States, our own laws were not concerned. Had they been brought within our limits all their crimes must have gone unpunished—for they had not violated our municipal or maritime, or martial laws. But the law of nations vests the right of retaliation in the commanding general, and the imbecility or dishonor of the Spanish authorities having justified the assertion of our beligerent rights, it was the duty of Gen. Jackson to fulfil the instructions of his goverment and bring these murderers to punishment.*

*Although the feeling and common sense of every man must convince him that the death of the prophet and Himithlimaco was due to humanity and justice, yet it may be proper to fortify that well founded decision by respectable authority. Vattel says, (520. 34) "When we

Let us now come to the case of Arbuthnot. From the recaptured American woman, who was the sole remaining survivor of Lieutenant Scott's party—from Cook his Clerk— from Phenix his acquaintance—from letters and papers found in a vessel of his, captured in the mouth of the Suawney, and others obtained from the Indians by our agent, it was proved incontestibly that "this advocate for peace," by misrepresenting the terms of the treaty of Ghent—the conduct of the American and the intentions of the British government, had incited in time of peace the Seminole Indians to hostilities against the United States. That to aid those hostilities, he had applied in behalf of the Indians, to various functionaries of Britain for supplies, and to disguise them for protection. That he had furnished them with intelligence and ammunition, for military purposes, and had given them advice and *orders* in the management of the war. That he had directed the seizure and presided at the condemnation of Hambly and Doyle in consequence of their being "the advocates for peace" with the U. States. That he had instigated and countenanced the massacre of Lt. Scott and his party, consisting of about 40 American citizens. That as an Indian Chief, he had permitted our gallant officers to be assassinated, our brave soldiers to be butchered and their helpless wives to be murdered, or with more horrible cruelty spared to see their infants "taken by the heels and their brains dashed out against the sides of the boat."* And that when one of the two women who had been spared (the wife of an American serjeant) was from pregnancy no longer able to keep up with the march of her captors, this "advocate for peace" ordered her to be put to death, and that accordingly she was bayoneted through the womb! From the same and other sources of proof it was demonstrated that Ambrister had not only instigated the Indians to war against the U. States, but had actually joined them with a party of runaway negroes and led them in battle—having used his commission as a British officer (a nation with which we were at peace) to promote his pernicious influence among them, and having endeavored by force to convert a Spanish fortress into a place of savage hostility against the United States.

These are the men whose crimes had destroyed so many innocent lives, for the sake of Otter skins and runaway slaves, and whose punishment is lamented with such dignified sorrow by Mr. Johnson, for the sake of Messrs. Adams and Clay. The evidence against them satisfied a court of gallant and intelligent officers of their guilt—satisfied the representatives and the government of the nation—and convinced the Courts of Spain and of England of the justice of their punishment. And yet because it is too voluminous and intricate to be readily examined,* Mr. Johnson found upon it imputations which with the rancourous, have the retributive property of injustice, and though aimed at the reputation of another, will only affect his own. There is one thing that ought to be mentioned as remarkable both in his ire and his grief—namely, his solemn affirmation that Arbuthnot who was hung, was "more injured" than Ambrister who was only shot—being convinced, as if from experience, that death by hanging is worse than death by shooting.

When a writer has clearly established his title to disbelief, it cannot be necessary to oppose a formal refutation to each of his misstatements especially if as in the case of Mr. Johnson, his errors have been exposed before. It appears that in the list of unfounded charges contained in the address, are two which had escaped my notice. They relate to the six militia men, and to the alleged usurpation of power to appoint militia officers. The first of these charges is now before the House of Representatives, and as its determination by that body will not only have the authority of truth but of the nation, I shall not enter on the easy task of refuting it. The second was long ago demolished by the memorial of Gen. Jackson which was presented to the Senate on the 6th of March, 1820, and which convinced Mr. Jefferson of his "salutary energy" in the prosecution of the Seminole War. It will be enough

---

are at war with a nation which observes no rules and grants no quarter, they may be chastised in the persons of those of them who may be taken. They are of the number of the guilty, and by this rigor the attempt may be made of bringing them to a sense of the laws of humanity." The prophet and Himithlimaco were not only "among the guilty," but the leaders of the guilty.

* Vide in the documents hereafter specified, Cook's letter, and the account obtained from the recaptured woman.

* For the evidence in these cases, see documents (35) accompanying the President's Message of the 2d December, 1818, and those (65) accompanying that of the 28th Dec. following, particularly the letter from Gen. Gaines of the 2d Dec. 1817, with its enclosures, that from Gen. Jackson, of the 8th April 1818, and the report of Col. Butler of the 3d May, in the first set. In the second, Nos. 45, 46 and 61, with the deposition of Lieut. M'Keever and the testimony of Phenix and Cook before the Court are chiefly apposite. In addition to the authority already produced for their execution and in illustration of the principle that must have satisfied the foreign governments on the subject; the following reference is made to Vattel, (52 o. 29.) "We may refuse to spare the life of an enemy who has surrendered, when the enemy has been guilty (a fortiori when he himself has) of some enormous breach of the laws of nations, and particularly when he has violated the laws of war." Arbuthnot and Ambrister had violated the laws of peace and war, of God and man—and to have treated them like ordinary prisoners of war would have been encouragement. Vattel (321) says, "retaliation may be exercised even on the innocent," a principle on which Gen. Washington acted in the case of Sir Charles Asgill, (Marshall 3d 391,) and that "when your army is out of your own territory the right of retaliation is in the commanding General, and he has the right of sacrificing the lives of the enemy to his own safety or that of his people, if he has to contend with an inhuman enemy, and to treat him as his own people have been treated. See also the details in the House of Lords, 11th May, 1810.

to refer the reader to that document, and particularly to the deposition of Col. Hayne and to the letter of Colonels Dyer and Williamson, in its appendix for proof that the charge is absolutely and totally false. Would it were in my power also to convince him that Mr. Johnson does not know it to be so.

Having thus completed the exposure of this labored attempt to degrade a great citizen and delude a great state, it remains to look at the character and condition of the body of which it purports to be the offspring. In individual character it is enviable, in numbers respectable, but in popular influence and constitution, meagre and scant. Like a dying peach tree, it has all leaves and no fruit. It appears to be more numerous than the House of Delegates, the broadest representation known in the State, and yet, consisting as it does of detached and discontented politicians, its constituents would hardly form a brigade of militia—and they would be all against any thing *military*. It is in truth a "most forcible feeble,"—and the address is the most enterprising experiment on record for propelling falsehood by the force of authority. Of this experiment, it is but justice to say, Mr. Johnson appears to be the organ, the manager, the *Mix*. But now that his torpid *torpedo* has exploded, what will he do with his corps of engineering judges, misguided by him into the defiles of dilemma and discredit? Will he *disband* them in the wilderness of fallacy and falsehood, far from their *sitting*, and as it would seem, their *superior* parts, bruising their delicate shins or bumping their tender rotundities against the stubborn obstructions of fact, and the bold projections of argument, straggling and scrambling to make their way back to privacy and privilege without steam boats and without milage.* In opposition to orders from Washington, he can never dare to "divulge their draggletailed show" in a regular retreat, as that might "offer an indignity to the Secretary of War," and produce his own dismission from *service*. The chaplain of the expedition too, the "oily man of God," what will become of his reverence? But this is a subject too serious for ridicule, too awful even for pleasantry. The God of Moses, from Sinar's fiery top, has said—"thou shalt not bare false witness against thy neighbour;" and the redeemer of mankind, the Lord of meekness and compassion denounces punishment on "evil speaking," and says for every malicious word a man shall utter "he shall give an account at the day of Judgment!" For that account let the reverend gentleman prepare.

In respect to Mr. Johnson, it can hardly be said that modesty or eloquence is pre-eminent among his political virtues, or that his professional ability is likely to be decreased by infusions of talent into his general writings. Of him it will never be said—

"How sweet an Ovid was in Murray lost."

Acknowledging in his letter of adhesion, strong distrust and disapprobation of Mr. Adams, he yet insists that it is "ineffably stupid" in the people of Virginia, the most alert and spiritual devotees of liberty in the civilized world, not to postpone their decided favorite to the object of his public disesteem. Nor is he entitled to the praise of invention; for, after laboring lustily in the field of fiction, he furnishes his party with nothing original. While all his charges are false, not one of them is new; and though all his inferences are fallacious, most of them are trite. An indelicate memory furnishes his premises, and an immoderate presumption regulates his conclusions. Insensible to the grandeur of the character he traduces, he seems forgetful of the intelligence of the people to whom he appeals. But it is strange that an individual so inconsiderate of others, should not have more respect for himself. He does not appear to consider that by repeating, he adopts these stories—partakes of the disgraceful motion of the scandal, and marked as "the tenth transmitter" of falsehood, descends with the progress of an impenitent sinner, who sinks in infamy as he advances in age.

If these remarks should appear intolerant, it must be remembered that the re-action of injustice is proportioned to its violence; and if long, that for the poison of concentrated slander, the most effectual antidote is expanded truth.

JEFFERSON.

From the Ithaca Journal.

MR. ADAMS' DEFENCE OF GENERAL JACKSON.

There is a misconception of the *true character* of General Jackson, and an honest prejudice against him, existing in the minds of some persons, which an impartial investigation cannot fail to dissipate. Anxious that all such doubts should be removed, and that all true Americans should unite in the cause of principle against intrigue and corruption, with a confidence that they are at the same time yielding their support to talents and integrity, we shall occasionally notice those passing calumnies which the enemies of General Jackson have now revived, long after they have been triumphantly refuted, with the base hope that these refutations may have escaped the memory of some, and the observation of others. Of this class are the charges relative to the Seminole war, the invasion of Florida, the execution of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, &c. &c. Are not the retailers of these calumnies aware, that the charges were officially investigated by Congress, through Mr. *Clay's* instrumentality; and that, notwithstanding Mr. Clay's influence and exertions procured an unfavorable report of the Committee; yet that General Jackson was honorably acquitted by an almost unanimous vote

---

* Some few years ago, a brace of these administration judges took a fancy to travel in steamboats. One of them embarked high up on the Potomac and having coasted an immense peninsula, landed in Richmond. The other took water on some of the western rivers and made his way to the treasury either by Wheeling or New Orleans. In imitation of Mr. Adams they charged *constructive mileage*, when their legal mileage was on the direct ordinary route. The charge of one was thrice the amount of his just claim, that of the other about five times. The legislature made them disgorge, although Mr. Clay had sanctioned the doctrine, in allowances, when Speaker, to his western friends. The matter occasioned some anger and much fun in Virginia, all at the expense of the steamboat judges.

of Congress? Do they not know that General Jackson was ably justified and defended by Mr. Adams; and that this justification stands upon record as the most able and honorable act of Mr. Adams' public life? Admitting that General Jackson, in the emergencies of his trying situation, surrounded by an insidious and savage enemy, with the cries of the desolate, and the blood of their murdered women and children, appealing to him for vengeance—admit, we say, that under these circumstances he did overstep the bounds of propriety—can the American bosom find for him no excuse, no palliation—while the *calculating* politician, who sits down free from danger or alarm, and coolly and deliberately in his closet *justifies* all his acts, is taken to its confidence?—The heated, over-zealous partisans, who urge these charges against General Jackson, seem blind to the dilemma in which they place their favorite. If General Jackson is guilty, Mr. Adams cannot be innocent: but the crime of the one must be ascribed to impulse, to necessity; while that of the other is the result of cool and deliberate depravity! The virtuous and enlightened American, however, who would rather sympathise with the friends than with the enemies of his country, will find no grounds in these transactions, for the condemnation of either. He will recognise in the conduct of. Gen. Jackson, the intrepid warrior, the brave and disinterested patriot; and in that of Mr. Adams, the unprejudiced advocate of his country's rights, the faithful organ of the government and people. We have before us the letter of Mr Adams, then Secretary of State, dated Nov. 28, 1818, to Mr. Irving, Minister Plenipotentiary to Spain, containing his defence of General Jackson's conduct. It comprises an interesting history of the Seminole war, and the events which followed. We shall extract from it as liberally as our present limits will permit; and we ask the revilers of General Jackson, and those who are honestly prejudiced against him, to read these extracts with attention.

"In the month of August, 1814, while a war existed between the United States and Great Britain, to which Spain had formally declared herself neutral, a British force, not in the fresh pursuit of a defeated and flying enemy, not overstepping an imaginary or equivocal boundary between their own territories, and those belonging in some sort, as much to their enemy as to Spain; but approaching by sea, and by a broad and open *invasion* of the Spanish province, at a thousand miles, or an ocean's distance from *any* British territory, landed in Florida, took possession of Pensacola, in the fort of Barancas, and invited by public proclamations, (doc. 1.) all the runaway negroes, all the savage Indians, all the pirates, and all the traitors to their country, whom they knew, or imagined to exist within reach of their summons, to join their standard, and wage an exterminating war against the portion of the United States immediately bordering upon this neutral and thus violated territory of Spain. The land commander of this British force, was a certain Col. Nicholls, who driven from Pensacola, by the approach of Gen. Jackson, actually left to be blown up the Spanish fort at Barrancas, when he found it could not afford him protection, and evacuating that part of the province, landed at another, established himself on the Apalachicola river, and there erected a fort, from which to sally forth with his motley tribe of black, white and red combatants, against the defenceless borders of the United States, in that vicinity. A part of this force consisted of a corps of colonial marines, levied in the British colonies, in which George Woodbine was a Captain, and Robert Christie Ambristie, was a Lieutenant.

For several months after the ratification of the treaty of Ghent, this post was retained. Remonstrances were made to the British Government; the conduct of Nicholls disavowed, and the fort eventually abandoned by him. This fort, however, Mr. A. states, was retained by the banditti to whom Nicholls had left it, "as a post from which to commit depredations, outrages, murders, &c." notwithstanding Gen. Jackson, in April, 1816, "wrote a letter to the Governor of Florida, calling upon him to put down this common nuisance to the peaceable inhabitants of both countries."

"In the year 1817, Alexander Arbuthnot, of the island of New Providence, a British subject, first appeared as an English trader in Spanish Florida, and as the successor of Colonel Nicholls, in the employment of instigating the Seminole and outlawed Red Stick Indians to hostilities against the United States, by reviving the pretence that they were entitled to all the lands which had been ceded by the Creek Nation to the United States, in August 1814. * * * In his infernal instigations he was but too successful. No sooner did he make this appearance among the Indians, accompanied by the prophet Hillis Hadjo, returned from his expedition to England, than the peaceful inhabitants of the borders of the United States, were visited with all the horrors of savage war; the robbery on their property, and the barbarous and indiscriminate murder of women, infancy and age.

"After the repeated expostulations, warnings, and offers of peace, through the summer and autumn of 1817, on the part of the United States, had been answered only by renewed outrages, and after a detachment of 40 men, under Lieutenant Scott, accompanied by seven women, had been waylaid and murdered by the Indians, orders were given to General Jackson, and an adequate force was placed at his disposal to terminate the war. It was ascertained that the Spanish force in Florida was inadequate for the protection even of the Spanish territory itself, against this mingled horde of lawless Indians and negroes; and although their devastations were committed within the limits of the United States, they immediately sought refuge within the Floridaline, & there only were to be overtaken. The necessity of crossing the line was indispensable; for it was from beyond the line that the Indians made their murderous incursions within that of the United States. It was there that they had their abode; and the territory belonged, in fact, to them, although within the borders of the Spanish jurisdiction. There it was that the American commander met the pricipal resistance from them; there it was that were found the still bleeding scalps of our citizens, freshly butchered by them; there it was that he released the only woman who had

been suffered to survive the massacre of the party under lieutenant Scott.

"In the course of his pursuit, as he approached St. Marks, he was informed direct from the Governor of Pensacola, that a party of the hostile Indians had threatened to seize that fort, and that he apprehended the Spanish garrison there was not in strength sufficient to defend it against them. This information was confirmed from other sources; and, by the evidence produced upon the trial of Ambrister, is proved to have been exactly true. By all the laws of neutrality, and of war, as well as of prudence and of humanity, he was warranted in anticipating his enemy by the amicable, and, that being refused, by the forcible occupation of the fort. There will need no citations from printed treatises on international law, to prove the correctness of this principle. It is engraved in adamant on the common sense of mankind. No writer upon the laws of nations, ever pretended to contradict it. None, of any reputation or authority, ever omitted to assert it."

Mr. Adams states, that in the Fort of St. Marks, Arbuthnot was found "an inmate of the commandant's family;" that here he held his councils with the hostile Indians, supplied them with ammunition, provisions, &c. He states that the conduct of the Governor of Pensacola was equally reprehensible, and that upon the approach of Gen. Jackson to Pensacola, the Governor of Pensacola threatened to meet and expel him from the territory with force.

"It became, therefore, in the opinion of Gen. Jackson, indispensably necessary to take from the Governor of Pensacola, the means of carrying his threat into execution. Before the forces under his command, the savage enemies of his country had disappeared. But he knew that the moment those forces should be disbanded, if sheltered by the Spanish fortresses, if furnished with ammunitions and supplies by Spanish officers, and, if aided and supported by the instigation of Spanish encouragement, as he had every reason to expect they would be, they would re-appear, and fired, in addition to their ordinary ferociousness, with revenge for the chastisement they had so recently received, would again rush with the war-hatchet and the scalping-knife, into the borders of the United States, and mark every footstep with the blood of their defenceless citizens. So far as all the native resources of the savages extended, the war was at an end, and General Jackson was about to restore to their families and their homes, the brave volunteers who had followed his standard, and who had constituted the principal part of his force. This could be done with safety, leaving the regular portion of his troops to garrison his line of forts, and two small detachments of volunteer cavalry to scour the country round Pensacola, and sweep off the lurking remnants of savages, who had been scattered and dispersed before him."

Gen. Jackson, therefore, took possession of Pensacola, "not in hostility to Spain, (says *Mr.* Adams,) but as a necessary measure of self-defence," intending to restore it whenever the Spanish authorities could occupy it with a complete force.

Mark, now, the strong language in which *Mr.* Adams justifies these proceedings of Gen. Jackson; and in the spirit of which he must stand justified in the hearts of the American people.

"But the President will neither inflict punishment, nor pass a censure upon Gen. Jackson, for that conduct, the motives of which were founded in the purest patriotism; of the necessity for which he had the most immediate and effectual means of forming a judgment; and the vindication of which is written in every page of the law of nations, as well as in the first law of nature, self-defence."

The above are extracts from Mr. Adams's letter, which relates to what is termed General Jackson's INVASION *of Florida*—"the motives for which (to repeat the emphatic language of Mr. Adams) were founded in the purest patriotism; of the *necessity* of which he had the most immediate and effectual means of judging; and the VINDICATION of which is written in every page of the law of nations, as well as in the first law of nature, *self-defence.*" We shall now give a few of Mr. Adams' s remarks, relative to the true character and well merited fate of Arbuthnot and Ambrister.

"The connexion between Arbuthnot and Nicholls, and between Ambrister, Woodbine and M'Gregor, is established beyond all question, by the evidence produced at the trials before the court-martial. From his letter to Hambly, dated 3d May, 1817, [see the document marked G in the proceedings of the court-martial,] it appears that his trading was a pretence; and that his principal purpose was to act as the agent of the Indians of Florida, and outlaws from the Creeks, to obtain the aid of the British government in their hostilities against the United States. He expressly tells Hambly there, 'that the chief of those outlaws was the principal cause of his (Arbuthnot's) being in the country; and that he had come with an answer from Earl Bathurst, delivered to him by Gov. Cameron of New Providence, to certain Indian talks, in which this aid of the British government had been solicited.

Hambly himself had been left by Nicholls as the agent between the Indians and the British government, but having found that Nicholls had failed in his attempt to prevail upon the British government to pursue this clandestine war, in the midst of peace, and that they were not prepared to support his pretence, that half a dozen outlawed fugitives from the Creek nation; when Arbuthnot, the incendiary, came, and was instigating them by promises of support from Great Britain, to commence their murderous incursions into the United States, Hambly, at the request of the chiefs of the Creeks themselves, wrote to him, warning him to withdraw from among that band of outlaws, and giving him a solemn foreboding of the doom that awaited him from the hand of justice, if he persevered in the course that he pursued. Arbuthnot nevertheless persisted; and while he was deluding the wretched Indians with the promise of support from England, he was writing letters for them to the British minister in the United States, to the Governor Cameron of New Providence, to Col. Nicholls, to be laid before the British government, and even to the Spanish Governor of St. Augustine, and the Governor General of the Havana, soliciting, in all quarters, aid and support, arms and ammunition, for the Indians against the United States, bewailing the destruction of the

negro fort, and charging the British government with having drawn the Indians into war with the United States, and deserting them after the peace." * * * *

"Let us come to the case of Ambrister. He was taken in arms, leading and commanding the Indians in the war against the American troops; and to that charge, upon his trial, pleaded guilty." * * * * *

Documents are here quoted and facts related, showing the connexion of Ambrister with Woodwine, and the hostile savages. Mr. Adams then gives the following recital of inhuman butcheries to which the savages were instigated by these wretches; and he asks, if they are not "sufficient to cool the sympathies" excited by their execution!

"The Spanish government is not, at this day, to be informed, that, cruel as war in its mildest forms must be, it is, and necessarily must be, doubly cruel when waged with savages; that savages make no prisoners but to torture them; that they give no quarters; that they put to death, without discrimination of age or sex. That these ordinary characteristics of Indian warfare, have been applicable, in their most heart-sickening horrors, to that war left us by Nicholl's, as his legacy, reinstigated by Woodbine, Arbuthnot, and Ambrister, and stimulated by the approbation, encouragement, and aid of the Spanish commandant at St. Marks, is proof required? Entreat the Spanish Minister of State, for a moment, to overcome the feelings, which details like these must excite, and to reflect, if possible, with composure upon the facts stated in the following extracts, from the documents enclosed:

Letter from sailing-master Jairus Loomis to Commodore Daniel T. Patterson, 13th August, 1816, reporting the destruction of the negro fort:

"On examining the prisoners, they stated that Edward Daniels, O. S. who was made prisoner in the boat, on the 17th July, *was tarred and burnt alive.*"

Letter from Archibald Clarke to General Gaines, 26th February, 1817. (Message, P. U. S. to Congress, 25th March, 1818, p. 9.)

"On the 24th inst. the house of Mr. Garret, residing in the upper part of this county, near the boundary of Wayne county, (Georgia,) was attacked during his absence, near the middle of the day, by this party [of Indians,] consisting of about fifteen, who shot Mrs. Garret in two places, and then despatched her by stabbing and scalping. Her two children, one about three years, the other two months, were also murdered, and the eldest scalped; and the house was then plundered of every article of value, and set on fire."

Letter from Peter B. Cook, (Arbuthnot's clerk,) to Eliza A. Carney, at Nassau, dated Suwahnee, 19th January, 1818, giving an account of their operations with the Indians, against the Americans, and the massacre of Lt. Scott and his party.

"There was a boat that was taken by the Indians, that had in it thirty men, seven women, four small children. There were six of the men got clear, and one woman saved, and all the rest of them got killed. The children were taken by the leg, and their brains dashed out against the boat."

If the bare recital of scenes like these cannot be perused without shuddering, what must be the agonized feelings of those whose wives and children are, from day to day, and from night to night, be exposed to the victims of the same barbarity: Has mercy a voice to plead for the perpetrators and instigators of deeds like these? Should inquiry, hereafter, be made, why, within three months after this event, the savage Hamathli Meico, upon being taken by the American troops, was, by order of their commander, immediately hung, let it be told, that that savage was the commander of the party, by which those women were butchered, and those helpless infants were thus dashed against the boat. Contending with such enemies, although humanity revolts at entire retaliation upon them, and spares the lives of their feeble and defenceless women and children, yet mercy, herself, surrenders to retributive justice the lives of their landing warriors taken in arms, and still more the lives of the foreign, white incendiaries, who, disowned by their own governments, and disowning their own natures, degrade themselves beneath the savage character, by voluntarily descending to its level. Is not this the dictate of common sense? Is it not the usage of legitimate warfare? Is it not consonant to the soundest authorities of national law? "When at war (says Vattel) with a ferocious nation, which observes no rules, and grants no quarter, they may be chastised in the persons of those of them who may be taken; they are of the number of the guilty, and by this rigor the attempt may be made of bringing them to a sense of the laws of humanity." And again: "As a general has the right of sacrificing the lives of his enemies to his own safety, or that of his people, if he has to contend with an inhuman enemy, often guilty of such excesses, he may take the lives of some of his prisoners, and treat them as his own people have been treated." The justification of these principles is found in their salutary efficacy for terror and for example."

It appears that Arbuthnot and Ambrister were executed—not as some of the revilers of Gen. Jackson have asserted, *without trial*—but conformably to the sentence of a regular court martial, and Mr. Adams thus sums up in conclusion, his justification of the measure:

"That the two Englishmen, executed by order of Gen. Jackson, were not only identified with the savages, with whom they were carrying on the war against the United States, but that one of them was the mover and fomenter of the war, which, without his interference and false promises to the Indians of support from the British government, never would have happened; that the other was the instrument of war against Spain, as well as the United States, commissioned by M'Gregor and expedited by Woodbine, upon their project of conquering Florida, with these Indians and negroes; that as accomplices of the savages, and, sinning against their better knowledge, worse than savages, General Jackson, possessed of their persons and the proofs of their guilt, might, by the lawful and ordinary usages of war, have hung them both without the formality of a trial; that, to allow them every possible opportunity of refuting the proofs, or of showing any circumstance in extenuation of their crimes, he gave them the be-

sent of trial by a court martial of highly respectable officers: that the defence of one consisted solely and exclusively of technical cavils at the nature of part of the evidence against him, and the other confessed his guilt."

Thus Mr. Adams not only justifies General Jackson, in the execution of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, but he goes farther; he would have justified him, had he *"hung them both* WITHOUT THE FORMALITY OF A TRIAL!" After this, let not the supporters of Mr. *Adams* arraign the conduct of *General Jackson* as connected with his arduous and patriotic services in the public defence; but let them *"cool their sympathies"* for the enemies of their country, and seek some more honorable method of promoting the success of their favorite.

THE TRICKS OF THE COALITION.

We have before us a letter from a highly respectable gentleman in New Hampshire, to his friend in this city, who says:

"You ask, what are the causes (of the election of Bell &c.) There is no doubt that the coffin handbills, and the story of the Dickinson duel effected it. All you have seen in the papers, and heard, can give you but a very imperfect idea of the exertions which were made to secure votes for the Administration ticket. These handbills, spurious lives of Jackson, &c. &c. were carried to *every house in every town*, as far as my knowledge extends. Thousands of them were brought to ——— and persons were hired to go and read them to the ignorant"

A friend from Delaware has forwarded to us a pamphlet which purports to be an impartial account of General Jackson, but which is in fact a compilation of all the falsehoods which the fruitful press of the coalition has invented.

The elections in Virginia are now in progress, and the last Intelligencer, printed at Lexington, contains just so much of Mr. Barbour's shuffled up documents, relative to the six militia men, as was arranged by him to make an impression that they were called into service for three months.

We have before said that the Legislature of Tennessee passed an act authorizing the Governor to call into service a portion of the militia, for the purpose of putting an end to the Creek war. Under this act several regiments were placed under the command of General Jackson, in 1813. *They were honorably discharged at the end of three months.* Speaking of these men, the Governor in his letter of the 10th of December, 1813, said:

Willie Blount to the Secretary of War.

NASHVILLE, 10th Dec., 1813.

SIR: The force from this State, called into service to act against the hostile Creeks, is composed, in part, of United States' volunteers, enrolled under the acts of Congress; of the militia, detached under a requisition from the War Department; and, in part of volunteers, who, being best armed, turned out, upon the pressing emergency, to repel an approaching invasion of this State and the Mississippi Territory. The first named, think that their term of service expires (as I have before advised you) on this day. The second, I understand, are of opinion, that their term of service will expire at the end of three months from their entrance into service; that time being considered, by the militia law of this State, passed prior to the act of Congress under which the detachment was made, as a tour of duty. The third description, I have reason to believe, consider that they ought [not] to be expected to serve longer than a three months' tour from their entrance into service, if that long. When these troops were called into service, the term they were expected to serve was not mentioned in the instructions I received from the War Department, or in the act of the General Assembly of this State, under which a part of the force was called out; neither was it mentioned in my order calling them out—I not having been advised of the most acceptable term to the Government, and knowing no other limitation to their service than such as was provided for by acts of Congress, unless sooner discharged by order of the President.

I believe the principal reason why these troops, in part, feel a desire to be discharged on the 10th inst is, that the volunteers think that they should not be compelled to serve longer than one year from the time they were called into service, as they have held themselves ready to act at the call of Government since the 10th December, 1813. This has occasioned much uneasiness and embarrassment at camp. The balance probably are influenced by their recollection of a tour of duty under the provisions of the militia law of this State, and by their want of clothing, &c. for a longer term of service; and another argument may be, that the circumstances under which they were called (to repel an approaching invasion, in part) did not admit of delay in their making the necessary preparation for a tour of six months, as the act of Congress respecting detached militia requires, unless sooner discharged by order of the President; in other words, they had not time to prepare. Their promptitude promoted the service; their prompt attention to the call of Government, and the important services they have rendered in the field, during the short term they have been in service, teaches the belief, that they cannot be actuated, in their willingness to return, for any other reasons than the abovementioned. These facts and opinions are stated for the information of Government, with whom alone it rests to determine how long they shall serve, to order their discharge, and likewise to order, in the event of their discharge, how their places are to be supplied. It is presumed that the object of the campaign is not yet effected, and it may not be for some time to come, with best exertions.

Under these circumstances, and from a desire, felt here, to promote the good of the service, it would be acceptable to the men in service to be informed how long they are expected to serve, and, if they are to be discharged, by whose order, and how their places are to be supplied. Information on these points is respectfully solicited, believing that the good of the service, and the situation of this frontier, require it. I am requested to make these inquiries. I have the honor, &c.

WILLIE BLOUNT

The Hon. SECRETARY OF WAR

In reply to this letter, the Secretary of War wrote as follows:

The Secretary of War to Governor Blount:

WAR DEPARTMENT, Jan. 3, 1814.

SIR: Your Excellency's letter of the 10th ult. has been received.

It is thought most advisable, under all circumstances, that the construction given to their engagements, by the organized volunteers of 1812, be admitted. In no other case, however, have volunteers of the same description refused to make good three hundred and sixty-five days' actual service.

The militia may be considered as having been called out under the law of 1795, which limits the service to three months. The President is the more disposed to make this decision, as the State law provides that a period of three months shall be deemed a tour of duty, and as the spirit and patriotism of Tennessee leaves no doubt but that a succession of corps, competent to the objects of Government, will be regularly provided.

Your excellency has been informed that Mr. McGhee, the contractor, was supplied with funds to meet the requisitions for provisions, and his receipt for money, which you furnished for his accommodation, is herewith returned. It was distinctly stated by him, that your Excellency would be paid out of the advance which he received while at this place.

J. ARMSTRONG.

GOV. BLOUNT, of Tennessee.

It will be seen that this correspondence reported by the Secretary of War, proves that the troops to which it referred, were called into service by the State of Tennessee, and that the reason assigned is, that the troops having been called into service under the State authority, considered that their term of service was limited to three months. That they were discharged at the end of three months, appears from the following address of General Jackson to the troops. (See Eaton's life of Jackson, page 121:)

"Your General having reported that your term of service will expire on the 14th, I assume no claim on you beyond that period. But, although I cannot demand as a right, the continuance of your services, I do not despair of being able to obtain them through your patriotism. For what purpose was it that you quitted your homes, and penetrated the heart of the enemy's country Was it to avenge the blood of your fellow citizens, inhumanly slain by that enemy;—to give security in future to our extended and unprotected frontier, and to signalize the valour by which you were animated? Will any of these objects be attained if you abandon the campaign at the time you contemplate? Not one! Yet an opportunity shall be afforded you, if you desire it. If you have been really actuated by the feelings, and governed by the motives, which your commanding general supposes influenced you to take up arms, and enter the field in defence of your rights, none of you will resist the appeal he now makes, or hesitate to embrace with eagerness, the opportunity he is about to afford you.

"The enemy, more than half conquered, yet deriving encouragement and hope from the tardiness of our operations, and the distractions which have unhappily prevailed in our camp, are again assembling below us. Another lesson of admonition must be furnished them. They must again be made to feel the weight of that power which they have, without cause, provoked to war; and to know, that although we have been slow to take up arms, we will never lay them from our hands until we have secured the objects that impelled us to the resort. In less than eight days I shall leave this encampment to meet and fight them. Will any of you accompany me? Are there any amongst you, who, at a moment like this, will not think it an outrage upon honor, for her feelings to be tested by a computation of time? What if the period for which you tendered your services to your country has expired—is that a consideration with the valiant, the patriotic, and the brave, who have appeared to redress the injured rights of that country, and to acquire for themselves the name of glory? Is it a consideration with them, when those objects are still unattained, and an opportunity of acquiring them is so near at hand? Did such men enter the field like hirelings—to serve for pay? Does all regard for their country, their families, and themselves, expire with the time for which their services were engaged? Will it be a sufficient gratification to their feelings, that they served out three months, without seeing the enemy, and then abandoned the campaign, when the enemy was in the neighborhood, and could be seen and conquered in ten days! Any retrospect they can make, of the sacrifices they have encountered, and the privations they have endured, will afford but little satisfaction under such circumstances;—the very mention of the Creek war, must cover them with the blushes of shame, and self-abasement. Having engaged for only three months, and that period having expired, you are not bound to serve any longer:—but are you bound by nothing else? Surely, as honorable and high-minded men, you must, at such a moment as the present, feel other obligations than the law imposes. A fear of the punishment of the law, did not bring you into camp;—that its demands are satisfied, will not take you from it. You had higher objects in view,—some greater good to attain. This, your General believes,—nor can he believe otherwise, without doing you great injustice.

"Your services are not asked for longer than twenty days; and who will hesitate making such a sacrifice when the good of his country and his own fame are at stake? Who under the present aspect of affairs, will even reckon it a sacrifice? When we set out to meet this enemy, this post must be retained and defended; if any of you will remain, and render the service, it will be no less important than if you had marched to the battle; nor will your General less thankfully acknowledge it. Tuesday next, the line of march will be taken up: and in a few days thereafter, the objects of the excursion will be effected. As patriotic men, then, I ask you for your services; and thus long, I have no doubt you will cheerfully render them. I am well aware, that you are all anxious to return to your families and homes, and that you are entitled to do so; yet stay a little longer,—go with me, and meet the enemy, and you can then return, not only with the consciousness of

having performed your duty, but with the glorious exultation of having done even more than they required."

Gov. Blount in his letter to the Secretary of War said: "When these troops were called into service, the term they were expected to serve was not mentioned in the instructions, I received from the War Department, or in the act of the General Assembly of the State, under which a part of that force were called out, neither was it mentioned in my order calling them out, I not having been advised of the most acceptable term to the government, and know of no other limitation to the service, than such as was provided by acts of Congress, unless sooner discharged by order of the President." In his letter to Gen. Jackson, he said: speaking of these troops, "The militia are detached for six months service."

Yet Gen. Jackson who believed that these men were legally called into the service for six months, and that the Governor was under the influence of fire-side politicians, whose patriotism was an appendage, worn as a coquette does a fine ribband merely for show, to be laid aside or applied as necessity may require,* when the appeal to their patriotism had failed to retain them in the service, gave them an honorable discharge. The exigencies of the service, and the patriotic feelings which actuated Gen Jackson, will be better spoken in his own language. A few days after this address to his volunteers, he wrote to Governor Blount as follows:

"Had your wish, that I should discharge a part of my force, and retire with the residue into the settlements, assumed the form of a positive order, it might have furnished me some apology for pursuing such a course, but by no means a powers? Do you wait for special instructions from the Secretary at War, which it is impossible for you to receive in time for the danger that threatens? How did the venerable Shelby act, under similar circumstances, or rather, under circumstances by no means so critical? Did he wait for orders to do what every man of sense knew—what every patriot felt to be right? He did not; and yet how highly and justly did Government extol his manly and energetic conduct! and how dear has his name become to every friend of his country!

"You say, that an order to bring the necessary quota of men into the field has been given, and that of course your power ceases; and, although you are made sensible that the order has been wholly neglected, you can take no measure to remedy the omission. Widely different, indeed, is my opinion. I consider it your imperious duty, when the men called for by your authority, founded upon that of the government, are known not to be in the field, to see that they be brought there; and to take immediate measures with the officer, who, charged with the execution of your order, omits or neglects to do it. As the executive of the State, it is your duty to see that the full quota of troops be constantly kept in the field, for the time they have been required. You are responsible to the government; your officer to you. Of what avail is it to give an order, if it be never executed, and may be disobeyed with impunity. Is it by empty mandates, that we can hope to conquer our enemies, and save our defenceless frontiers from butchery and devastation? Believe me, my valued friend, there are times when it is highly criminal to shrink from responsibility, or scruple about the exercise of our powers. There are times when we must disregard punctilious etiquette, and think only of serving our country. What is really our present situation? The enemy we have been sent to subdue, may be said, if we stop at this, to be only exasperated. The commander in chief, General Pinckney, who supposes me by this time prepared for renewed operations, has ordered me to advance and form a junction with the Georgia army; and, upon the expectation that I will do so, are all his arrangements formed for the prosecution of the campaign. Will it do to defeat his plans, and jeopardize the safety of the Georgia army? The General Government, too, believe, and have a right to believe, that we have now not less than five thousand men in the heart of the enemy's country: and on this opinion are all their calculations bottomed; and must they all be frustrated, and I become the instrument by which it is done? God forbid!

"You advise me to discharge or dismiss from service, until the will of the President can be known, such portion of the militia as have rendered three months' service. This advice astonishes me, even more than the former. I have no such discretionary power; and if I had, it would be impolitic and ruinous to exercise it. I believed the militia who were not specially received for a shorter period, were engaged for six months, unless the objects of the expedition should be sooner attained; and in this opinion I was greatly strengthened, by your letter of the 15th, in which you say, when answering my inquiry upon this subject, "the militia are detached for six months' service;" nor did I know, or suppose you had a different opinion, until the arrival of your last letter.

---

* Gen Jackson in a letter to Gen. William Cocke, dated Fort Strother, February 17th, 1814, said:

HEAD QUARTERS, }
FORT STROTHER, Feb. 17th, 1814. }

SIR, Your two letters of the 8th and 14th instant, have been received, but from the continued hurry of business with which I am surrounded, I have not had time to answer them until now.

The importance of the service you have rendered, and the deep interest you have taken in forwarding my views and the objects of the campaign, command my sincere thanks. I hope you will continue to aid in procuring the means and transporting the supplies to this place: the active exertions of a patriot of *sixty-five years of age, will certainly stimulate the youthful soldier to his duty;* such examples have become necessary; *I find those who talk most of war and make the greatest bustle about our injured rights at home, are the last to step forward in vindication of those rights.* Patriotism is an appendage which such men wear as a coquette does a fine ribband, merely for show, and to be laid aside or applied as necessity may require.

I have the honor to be, &c.

ANDREW JACKSON,
Major General commanding.

Colonel William Cocke.

this opinion must, I suppose, agreeably to your request, be made known to General Roberts' brigade, and then the consequences are not difficult to be foreseen. Every man belonging to it, will abandon me on the 4th of next month; nor shall I have the means of preventing it, but by full justification. As you would have no power to give such an order, I could not be inculpable in obeying, with my eyes open to the fatal consequences that would attend it. But a bare recommendation, founded, as I am satisfied it must be, on the artful suggestions of those fireside patriots, who seek in the failure of the expedition, an excuse for their own supineness; and upon the misrepresentations of the discontented from the army, who wish it to be believed, that the difficulties which overcame their patriotism are wholly insurmountable, would afford me but a feeble shield against the reproaches of my country or my conscience. Believe me, my respected friend, the remarks I make proceed from the purest personal regard. If you would preserve your reputation, or that of the State over which you preside, you must take a straight-forward determined course, regardless of the applause or censure of the populace, and of the forebodings of that dastardly and designing crew, who at a time like this, may be expected to clamour continually in your ears. The very wretches who now beset you with evil counsel, will be the first, should the measures which they recommend, eventuate in disaster, to call down imprecations on your head, and load you with reproaches. Your country is in danger—apply its resources to its defence! Can any course be more plain? Do you, my friend, at such a moment as the present, sit with your arms folded, and your heart at ease, waiting a solution of your doubts, and a definition of your the application of force, which, under such circumstances, I shall not be at liberty to use I have labored hard to reconcile these men to a continuance in service, until they could be honorably discharged, and had hoped I had, in a great measure, succeeded But your opinion, operating with their own prejudices, will give a sanction to their conduct, and render useless any further attempts. They will go; but I can neither discharge nor dismiss them. Shall I be told, that as they will go, it may as well be peaceably permitted, can that be any good reason why I should do an unauthorised act? Is it a good reason why I should violate the order of my superior officer, and evince a willingness to defeat the purposes of my government? And wherein does the "sound policy" of the measures that have been recommended consist? Or in what way are they "likely to promote the public good?" Is it sound policy to abandon a conquest thus far made, and deliver up to havoc, or add to the number of our enemies, those friendly Creeks and Cherokees, who, relying on our protection, have espoused our cause, and aided us with their arms? Is it good policy to turn loose upon our defenceless frontiers, five thousand exasperated savages, to reek their hands once more in the blood of our citizens? What! retrograde under such circumstances! I will perish first. No, I will do my duty: I will hold the posts I have established, until ordered to abandon them by the commanding general, or die in the struggle; long since have I determined not to seek the preservation of life at the sacrifice of reputation.

"But our frontiers, it seems, are to be defended, and by whom? By the very force that is now recommended to be dismissed: for I am first told to retire into the settlements, and protect the frontiers; next, to discharge my troops; and then, that no measures can be taken for raising others. No, my friend, if troops be given to me, it is not by loitering on the frontiers, that I will seek to give protection; they are to be defended, if defended at all, in a very different manner;—by carrying the war into the heart of the enemy's country. All other hopes of defence, are more visionary than dreams. What then is to be done? I'll tell you what: you have only to act with the energy and decision the crisis demands, and all will be well. SEND ME A FORCE ENGAGED FOR SIX MONTHS, AND I WILL ANSWER FOR THE RESULT—but withhold it, and all is lost,—the reputation of the State, and your's and mine, along with it."

In reply to this letter, Governor Blount wrote to General Jackson as follows:

Governor Blount to General Jackson.

"NASHVILLE, *December* 22, 1814.

Dear Sir: Since writing you fully of this date, I have received, by Major David Smith, your very interesting letter, replete with patriotic sentiments, dated the 15th instant. You will see, by my letter of the 10th, to the Secretary of War, how I am placed with the respect to instructions, which, as it relates to the good of the service, and a most righteous cause, in support of which you are most laudably and zealously engaged, I much regret *The unfortunate construction given by the troops, so generally, respecting their term of service, at this very interesting crisis in public affairs, in this section of the Union, is to be lamented; but, since it is the most general, and likely to become almost the universal, construction in camp; and since there is no authority vested here, that can be interposed, to give a counter current of opinion, with the prospect of effecting any permanent good to the service, or to the cause you are engaged in, and as it is likely that my letter of the 10th instant will produce new orders for a term of service yet to commence, which under all circumstances, would be most judicious in Government to give, the better to effect the objects of the campaign, more especially as there is reason to believe that a British fleet has arrived at Pensacola:* I cannot doubt but that the Government will shortly give new instructions to have a new force organized, to effect the objects of the campaign, & to oppose the British; and that the President will be satisfied to consider that the three months' tour performed by your, and by general Cockes detachments, with so much good to the service, and so much credit to yourselves, may terminate the present campaign."

It will be seen by this letter, a copy of which was enclosed to the Secretary of War, on the 24th of December, that Gov. Blount in reply to Gen Jackson's earnest appeal to to send him him men for six months, laments the unfortunate construction given to their term of service by the troops, says—that he has no power to interpose to give a counter current, and hopes that Government, meaning that of the United States, will give new orders, which it is hoped

will effect more permanent good to the service Accordingly Mr. Armstrong on the 11th of January says:

The Secretary of War, to Governor Blount.

WAR DEPARTMENT, Jan. 11, 1814.

SIR: You are authorized to supply, by militia drafts, or by volunteers, any deficiency which may arise in the militia division, under the command of Major General Jackson, and without referring, on this head, to this Department. It may be well that your Excellency should consult General Pickney on such occasions, as he can best judge of the whole number necessary to the attainment of the public objects.

I have the honor, &c.

J. ARMSTRONG.

His Exc'y the Governor of Tennesssee.

And again, on the 31st of January, 1814, he wrote:

"SIR: I had the honor to receive your Excellency's letter of the 5th inst. My letter of the 11th will have anticipated your inquiries relative to forther detachments of militia. The attention of the Paymaster of the Army will be particularly directed to the payment of the troops, who have been in service from Tennessee.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your excellency's most obedient servant,

(Signed,) J. ARMSTRONG."

His Excellency W. BLOUNT,
Governor of Tennessee.

Again on the 4th of February, the Secretary wrote to Gen. Jackson as follows:

The Secretary of War to General Jackson.

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Feb.* 4, 1814.

SIR: Since the receipt of your letter, of December 30th, the Governor of Tennessee has been required to call out the militia to reinforce your command, and provide for the exigencies of the service in that quarter, in which he is also required to consult the commanding General.

J. ARMSTRONG.

Gen. ANDREW JACKSON, *Fort Strother.*

Acting, as we presume, under these orders the Governor of Tennessee, on the 20th of May, 1814, issued the following general order:

"NASHVILLE, May 20, 1814.

SIR: In compliance with the requisition of Major General Thomas Pinckney, that the posts of Fort Williams, Fort Strother, Fort Armstrong, Fort Ross, and Forts Old and New Deposit, should be kept up, the doing of which he has confided to you, until the objects of the Government in relation to the war against the hostile Creek Indians shall have been fully effected; and from the probable expiration of the time of service of the troops, now occupying those important posts, commanded by Col. Bunch, prior to a final accomplishment of the views of Government in relation to the Creek war, *you will, without delay, order out one thousand militia infantry of the 2d division, for the term of* SIX MONTHS, unless sooner discharged by order of the President of the United States, or, you may accept a tender of service of the above number of volunteer infantry from the 2d division for the aforesaid term, for the purpose of garrisoning the said posts, at your option: *which latitude, in relation to calls for men touct against the Creeks, in furtherance of the views of government in that behalf, is given to me by instructions from the War Department.* Those troops will be commanded by an officer of the rank of colonel, and will be required to rendezvous at Fayetteville, on the 20th of June next: thence they will proceed to the above-mentioned posts, under your order, in such number to each, as you shall assign. It is important to the public interests, that they should be at their posts between the 1st and 10th of July next, as about that time the term of service of the troops, now there, under colonel Bunch, will expire, and at which posts there is much public property committed to their charge.

You will order the muster master to attend and muster the troops into service—you will call on the contractor for provisions, and on the assistant deputy quartermaster likewise, for supplies in his department.

(Signed) WILLIE BLOUNT."

To Maj Gen. ANDREW JACKSON,
Second division of Tennessee Militia."

Upon the receipt of this order, Gen. Jackson, then a Major General in the militia of the State, issued the following general order:

"*Brave Tennesseeans of the 2d division.* The Creek war, through the Divine aid of Providence, and the valor of those engaged in the campaign, in which you bore a conspicuous share, has been brought to a happy termination. Good policy requires that the territory conquered should be garrisoned, and possession retained, until appropriated by the Government of the United States. In pursuance of this policy, and to relieve the troops now stationed at forts Williams, Strother, and Armstrong, on the Coosa river, as well as Old and New Deposit, I am commanded by his excellency, Governor Blount, to call from my division one thousand men in the service of the United States, for the period of six months, unless sooner discharged by order of the President of the United States.

The Brigadier Generals, or officers commanding the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 9th Brigades of the 2d division, will forthwith furnish from their brigades respectively, by *draft* or *voluntary enlistment*, two hundred men, with two captains, two first, two second, and two third lieutenants, and two ensigns well armed and equipped for active service, to be rendezvoused at Fayetteville, Lincoln county, in the State of Tennessee, on the 20th of June next; and then be organized into a regiment, at which place the field officers, and the muster master will be ordered to meet them.

Officers commanding the brigades composing the 2d division of Tennessee militia, are charged with the prompt and due execution of this order.

ANDREW JACKSON, *Maj. Gen.*
Commanding 2d division, M. T."

Under this order the six militiamen were mustered into service on the 20th of June, for a tour of *six months*, in conformity with General Jackson's pressing request to Gov. Blount, in his letter of the 15th of December, saying—"*send me a force engaged* FOR SIX MONTHS, *and I will answer for the result—but withhold it and all is lost.*"

We have thus proved that these men were legally mustered into service for six months, which more fully appears from an extract from the letter of the Secretary of War, to the editor of this paper, dated

DEPARTMENT OF WAR,
October 16, 1827.

"The motives which induced me to comply with your former request have influenced me again, though not without difficulty, to transmit you the information requested, which is disclosed in the following extract from a report made to me by the third Auditor: 'It appears Col. Philip Pipkin's regiment was mustered into service at Fayetteville, in June, 1814, for six months, by Robert Hays, Assistant Inspector General of the militia of said State, and that said regiment was mustered out of service by the same officer, at the same place, on the 27th January, 1815; the services generally commenced on the 20th June, 1814, from which time to the 27th January, 1815, the troops were generally paid, exclusive of travelling allowances from Fayetteville to their homes.'"

From this certificate it appears that the six militia men were mustered into service on the 20th of June, 1814, and the inquiry naturally arises—why did the Secretary of War bring into his report the correspondence with the Governor of Tennessee, about militia who were dismissed the service on the 14th of December, 1813? We have met this view of the case, because we have had no desire to blink the question in its worst shape. We might well rest our defence of Gen. Jackson, so far as he is involved in this inquiry, upon the simple fact that the Governor of Tennessee was the source through whom he received the order of the Secretary of War, relative to the term of service—the order of the Governor expressly says that the requisition is made for a term of *six months, under the instructions of the War Department.* Gen. Jackson was bound to believe and to execute the order of the Governor of the *State.*

So much for the term of service. But the term of service has nothing to do with the merits of the case. Harris and his associates were condemned to die for mutiny and destruction of public property, committed before the expiration of three months. Col. Pipkin, their commanding officer said of them:

"A short time previous to this, *(the 20th of September)* the same party demolished the "bake house, destroyed the oven, and did ma- "ny other disorderly and mutinous acts. The "day previous to their desertion, a large num- "ber paraded armed, and marched towards "the commissary stores. I ordered them to "disperse, but my order was disregarded, and "they forced the guards stationed for the pro- "tection of the stores. The Commissary an- "ticipated their design, closed and locked the "door, but that did not restrain them; for one "of the men, (who was afterwards shot by sen- "tence of the court martial,) immediately "snatched up a pick-axe, and cut the door off "its hinges. They then entered the house, "and took out eleven barrels of flour, and made "public proclamation to all who intended going "home, to come forward and draw rations, "which they did. They afterwards proceeded "to the bullock pen, and shot down two "beeves, and the balance taking fright, broke "the pen and ran some distanae, where they "killed a third."

Colonel Russel who is appealed to in Binns' Coffin Handbill, in reply to Col. Arthur L. Campbell, of Kentucky, says:

7th. Mutiny and desertion are the highest crimes known to the law for the government of the army.

8th. The evidence in support of the charges against the militia was positive, and free from a shadow of doubt. They committed the offence in broad day light, in the presence of the troops that remained faithful, the agents of the contractor, and every body on the ground.

9th. They were without justification or excuse, though so long as they hoped for life, they alledged as an excuse, their pretended belief that no law existed to hold them to service more than three months, in which they had been sustained by the opinions of some of their officers. However, before their execution they abandoned this excuse, as they knew better—and said that those officers who had encouraged them to the fatal deed, ought to die as well as they.

Col. Russell is a friend of Mr. Adams, and having been referred to in the "coffin hand bill," as an eye witness, is entitled to be believed by the friends of the administration. He commanded the regiment who executed the sentence of the court, and in reply to the statement that these men were executed after the peace, he said:

"We had *no knowledge of a treaty of peace* having been signed at Ghent, till more than a month after the approval of the sentence, and 15 or 20 days after its execution. At such a time, the least relaxation in discipline might have proved ruinous to the country."

In reference to the State of the army at the time of the execution of these men, Col. Russell said:

14. "In the then state of things, the execution of the whole posse, although painful to behold, was nothing more than a due administration of justice; nor did I ever hear it doubted or questioned, till in the summer of 1824, when the whole affair was so perverted and misrepresented, that a stranger, if he believed the tale, must have thought that the General and all his officers delighted in shedding innocent blood for amusement. I felt bound to correct the absurd story, when and wherever I heard it, and I have always continued to do so."

Having thus, as we trust for the last time, noticed this affair of the six militiamen, we beg leave to make a few comments. It is painful to find ourselves constrained to speak in such terms of the Secretary of War; but we shrink not from duty. We are fortified with truth, and upon him be the consequences of his conduct.

Mr. Barbour during the past summer, in travelling through the country, retailed Binns' infamous pamphlet about Gen. Jackson. That he has lent himself to the further circulation of the charge, appears from the manner in which

he arranged the documents under the call of the House, on Mr. Sloane's resolution. That the documents were thus arranged by *him* appears from the fact that Gen. Duncan, the member of Congress from Illinois, called at his office a few days before his report was made, for the purpose of transacting some official business; Mr. Barbour begged him to call on some other day, and said that he was then engaged in examining the documents relative to the six militia men, and pointed to the papers which were spread before him on the table. Gen. Duncan casually mentioned this fact in conversation, and we now state it without his knowledge; but Mr. Barbour having, in a subsequent report, endeavored to charge the arrangement of the papers to the clerks in his Department, we appeal to Gen. Duncan, and to sundry other members of Congress, who have conversed with him on the subject, to confirm what we say.—The documents thus examined by Mr. Barbour were submitted to a committee, who found that he had so arranged them as to make an impression that Harris and his associates were called into service for three months. They exposed the imposition attempted to be practised upon the House. The Secretary of War, thus convicted, endeavored, by charging it to his clerks, to escape the odium of the act.

In the mean time, two title pages were made by the public printer, for the purpose of enabling the partisans of the coalition, to circulate the documents separate from the report of the Committee, in violation of the order of the House. That trick was also detected, by the vigilance of Col. Hamilton, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, when the partizans of the administration employed another print to publish a new edition, purporting to be upon authority of the House, although in direct violation of its order. Again, the party prints, acting upon the example set them here, print so much of the correspondence as relates to the militia, called into the service in 1813, by order of the Governor of Tennessee, who were discharged the service, on the 14th of December, 1813, and omit all that part of the correspondence, which relates to the six militiamen. To aid this fraudulent publication, the Secretary of War, *procured* from Mr. Charles J. Nourse, the following FALSE certificate, which in violation of the will of the House, he prefixed to his report.

Certificate of the Chief Clerk of the Department of War.

DEPARTMENT OF WAR, Jan. 24th, 1828.

I certify that I have, by direction of the Secretary of War, carefully examined the records of this Department, and that the accompanying papers, numbered from 1 to 12, are true copies of all the correspondence in the War Department, between the President or Secretary of War, and the Governor of Tennessee, during the late war, on the subject of the time for which the drafted militia of said State should serve in the armies of the United States; and I further certify, that it does not appear from the records of this Department, that any application was made by the Governor of Tennessee, to the War Department, on the subject of the length of service of the detachment of the Tennessee militia, detailed under the orders of the Governor of that State, issued on the 20th day of May, 1814, and afterwards placed under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Philip Pipkin; or that any orders, general or special, were made or issued by the President of the United States, or by the Secretary of War, concerning or relating to the length of service of that detachment. CHR. J NOURSE, *Chief Clerk.*

We say that this certificate was given in violation of the will of the House, because it was expressly stated by the members of the majority that they wanted no certificate or opinion from the Secretary of War. Yet he procured this certificate from the chief Clerk, which he substituted for his own.

We say that the certificate is false, because it asserts that it does not appear from the records of the department, that any application was made by the Governor of Tennessee, to the War Department, on the subject of the length of service of the detachment of Tennessee militiamen detailed under the orders of the Governor of that State, issued on the 20th day of May, 1814, and afterwards placed under the command of Lieut. Col. Pipkin; or that any orders general or special were made or issued by the President of the United States, or by the Secretary of War, concerning or relating to the length of service of that detachment"—when from the letters of Governor Blount and the Secretary of War, reported by Mr. Barbour, it appears that the whole of that correspondence related to the term of service of the troops then in the field, and those that were subsequently called into the service; and it further appears that Governor Blount not only understood the letters of the Secretary of War, to authorize him to call the troops under the command of Colonel Pipkin, into service for six months, but the Secretary of War, himself, so understood them. Why else, when Governor Blount wrote to him that he had construed the order, to authorize him to call out these men for six months, and that he had called them into service for that period, did the Secretary not inform him, that the orders had not been properly understood?

But what is to be the result of all this cant about the six militiamen? Why this political whining about men who had committed mutiny and arson? If Gen. Jackson has done wrong, in relation to these men, he had committed the offence before Mr. Barbour defended his conduct on another occasion; and Gen. Jackson is the same man now, that he was when Mr. Adams, in his reply to the Committee, notifying him of his election, said that Gen. Jackson was qualified for the duties of President. But we repeat the question—what is to be the result of this whining, political cant, about the six militiamen?

By the 7th article of the Rules and Articles of War, "Any officer or soldier, who shall begin, excite, or join in any mutiny or sedition, in any troop or company in the service of the U. States, or in any party, post, detachment, or guard, shall suffer death, or such other punishments, as, by a Court Martial, shall be inflicted." By the 8th article, a similar penalty is awarded, where any officer or soldier "does not use his utmost endeavors to suppress a mutiny, or, coming to the knowledge of an intend-

ed mutiny, does not, without delay, give information thereof to his commanding officer." And, by the 20th article, the crime of desertion, is punishable by death, or such other punishments, as, by sentence of a Court Martial shall be inflicted."

This law was enacted, on the principle that the militia was the bulwark of the national liberty, which can never be endangered, so long as the people are intelligent, and the militia are armed. The doctrine of our whining political hypocrites will lead to the establishment of large standing armies, and the subversion of liberty. Andrew Jackson is the candidate of the militia. He has led them to battle, to victory, and to glory. He has taught the militia to rely upon themselves, to quell domestic treason, or repel foreign invasion. Let it once be said, that a militia man is not subject to martial law, and it follows of course that regular troops must be employed to fight our battles. Such is the tendency of the profligate expedients, to which the desperate efforts to impair General Jackson's well earned popularity, have driven his enemies.

For the United States' Telegraph.

TO THE HON. MR. EVERETT,

A member of the House of Representatives of the United States, from Massachusetts.

SIR:—Since the translation of your friend and coadjutor, Mr. Daniel Webster, to the United States' Senate, you have been considered as the leader of the administration party in the House of Representatives; and, as such, I now humbly take leave to address you.

The speech which you delivered in the House, in February last, on the subject of Mr. Chilton's resolution for retrenchment, will furnish the theme on which I propose to make a few remarks. I should certainly have abstained from doing this, had I found in the replies of other gentlemen to you on the same subject, any, or a sufficient notice taken of some points which you made, and some matters of fact which you stated in the course of your argument on that resolution. I do not here allude to the obscene story which you undertook to relate to the House, (and of course to the females of the gallery) about the alleged *amour* between Mrs. Adams' maid-servant and "the Emperor of all the Russias;" nor to your still more disgusting allusion to the diabolical charge of incest against the late unfortunate Queen of France. The moral sense of the community will, I hope, judge correctly enough of this part of your performance in your new vocation, and, I believe, *maiden* speech, as the leader of your party. So far as I have yet heard it spoken of, I can assure you, that it is just as much approved of, as was the famous "Ebony and Topaz" *toast* of our very chaste and learned President, given on a late occasion at Baltimore. But let all that pass.

I have much more weighty matters to discourse about to you and to the public at present.

The relation in which you stand to our principal executive servants, [not *rulers*—I choose to call men and things by their proper names—so that those who are vested with a little brief authority may not, at last, forget what they really are, and finally conceit themselves to be rulers or masters, sure enough, and act accordingly.] The relation, I say, in which you stand to these personages, justifies the belief that, in your harangue, you spoke "*by authority*." I have, myself, no doubt of the fact; though it may very well be imagined that, in your zeal to serve yourself ultimately, you acted rather indiscreetly towards *your* rulers or masters. To speak in homely phraseology, *you let the cat out of the bag*. If, by this indiscretion, you fail in getting the next appointment of minister to England, or some other country, you have no body to blame but yourself.

Passing over other parts of your speech which, for the most part, have already been sufficiently answered and exposed by members of the House in their places, I will now advert to that part in which you notice the compensation allowed to our public ministers abroad. In order that there may be no mistake about this matter, I will take the trouble to transcribe from your revised speech, as published in the National Intelligencer, so much as relates to the subject now in hand.

"I have," (you said) "been induced to make these statements, not merely for the sake of a better understanding of the point, in the resolution on which it bears, but also in order to prepare the way for a satisfactory answer to some of the charges made against the President of the United States, relative to the account of his compensation and allowances as a foreign minister. This is a subject on which I enter with some reluctance:" (no wonder,) "it is not, perhaps, of the class which I should select to discuss on this floor." (You are right, Sir, *you* ought not to have touched it.) "It does not belong strictly to the debate; but as it has been introduced on the present occasion, with strong emphasis, and with the effect, no doubt, of giving sanction to what is said more at large on the same topic elsewhere. This is an important point; for the allegations have extended, not merely to a charge of extravagance, but of illegality and even fraud," (for which you might have added, the parties concerned ought, in justice, to have been impeached.) "High salaries" (you continue,) "are, I know, a popular subject of comment; and as those of the foreign ministers are, with a single exception, the highest paid under the government, it is natural that they should be obnoxious to complaint." (Not so, Sir, provided they be no more than *the law* allows.) "But, Sir," (you add) "it is an *undoubted truth*, that, high as they may be thought, great as the aggregate may seem for a service of a long series of years; they are *yet too small;* and *but for the extra allowance by which they are eked out, would be wholly inadequate to their object.*" So then! Say you so, Reverend Sir, that this is "an undoubted fact?" Very well. We thank you for this open and voluntary confession, that the administration is in the practice of violating their oaths and the law of the land. Deny this who dare. I will proceed to prove it.

The act of Congress of the 1st May, 1810, (Vol. 10, page 194,) and now in force, declares, "That the President of the United States shall *not* allow to any minister plenipotentiary, a *greater* sum than at the rate of nine thousand dollars

per annum, as a compensation for *all* his personal services *and expenses.*" Here, then, while the *law* declares that a foreign minister shall "*not* be allowed a greater sum than at the rate of nine thousand dollars per annum, as a compensation for *all* his personal services and expenses, the President decides, and, what is more daring, if possible, proclaims to the nation, through you, that these salaries, thus positively fixed, are "*too small;*" and but for the *extra* allowance by which they are *eked* out, would be wholly inadequate to their object!" That is to say, in plain English, as follows:—The President, wholly disregarding the law of the land, which fixes the compensation of our foreign ministers, thinks these salaries "*too small;*" and by way of increasing them according to *his own* views of the subject, illegally takes money from another fund for the purpose of making to these ministers an "*extra allowance,*" over and above that which the law has expressly provided? Now, if the President can thus increase the salaries fixed by law for one set of offices of the Government, what is to hinder him from making similar "extra allowances," to such other salary officers as he may think fit to reward for their services, or rather for their subserviency to his views? Suppose, for example, he should think that his own salary, or that of one or two, or more of his Secretaries, was "too small," in these times of pressing emergency, when proselytes must be gained at every hazard, could he not with equal propriety, and just as legally, make to himself or to them "*extra allowances,*" out of the *contingent fund*, in order to *eke* out so much, as, in his own opinion, would prevent the salaries fixed by law, from being "*wholly inadequate to their object?*" In sober seriousness, Sir, you have made a most precious confession. If what you state in this regard be true, and you say it is an undoubted truth; then I, unhesitatingly pronounce, that the President has been guilty of a "misdemeanor," for which he ought forthwith to be IMPEACHED. What, Sir! Has he not taken an oath to support the Constitution? Does not that instrument declare, among other things, that he shall "*take care that the laws are faithfully executed?* Are not these "*extra allowances*" made by the President to foreign ministers for the express purpose, as you tell us, of increasing their compensations beyond the salaries provided for them by law, most barefaced, palpable violations of law? Surely, there can be no man found in his senses, and who has the least regard for his own character, who will hesitate or doubt about a matter so plain as this. I lay down this principle, which I dare you or any other man, publicly to deny, or to attempt to controvert. That, in every case, where the law has provided a specific compensation to be allowed to a public functionary, for the performance of the duties attached to his station, no further, or "extra allowance" can be lawfully made to him by any executive officer of the Government, either out of the *contingent fund*, or any other fund belonging to the public. The fact which you have publicly stated, is a highly important one. The practice, of which you have advertised us, is directly in the teeth of the law of the land; and I do hope that, before you, or any body else, shall have a chance of profiting by it, the federal legislative will adopt some measure to correct the procedure. If, in a case so clear, justice is not done to the community, by the punishment of the guilty, I, for one, confess that I shall feel little hope in the long continuance of our present civil institutions, and almost as little concern in their downfall. I have no wish or desire to possess the shadow without the substance. If we have laws, let them be obeyed. If they are violated, no matter by whom; whether by the chief magistrate of the country or a mail-robber,—let the guilty be punished. On the *faithful* and *impartial* execution of the laws, rest the main pillars of every good government. Common sense will teach every man of the correctness of this doctrine; and common honesty, and a real regard for the interest and happiness of the country, ought to induce every citizen thereof, to give his aid in enforcing it.

Some other facts which you disclosed, in the course of your speech, may, perhaps, be hereafter noticed by me. I shall not touch the presidential question. I am no party politician; neither am I a seeker or an expectant of any office under this, or any other administration. But I am, for a single individual, a large contributor, in the way of taxes, to the support of the Federal Government; and, therefore, I the more feel it to be my duty, as it unquestionably is my right, to endeavor to expose fraud and prevent abuses on the people.

A FARMER.

P. S. I should have made this communication sooner, had not my other vocations prevented it. Persons in my situation have not generally as much leisure as you wealthy *capitalists*, for whom, and a few other favored individuals, as it would seem, Congress almost exclusively legislate; and, what is worst of all for us,—*at our expense.* This delay, however, will not, it is to be hoped, prevent the Congress from investigating this subject, soon after the tariff-bill shall have been disposed of.

F.

GEN. JACKSON AND MR. CLAY'S BOOK.

The Illinois Gazette, which paper it will be recollected charged Gen. Jackson with profane language at the mouth of Cumberland, on hearing of Mr. Clay's book, has published a letter from a Mr. Jesse Patterson, and a certificate of a Mr. Thomas Willis and the said Jesse, detailing certain declarations of a Doctor Miller, as a justification of that slander.

We know nothing of either Mr. Patterson, Mr. Willis, or Doctor Miller; the latter may or may not have said what they charge. But the fact admitted by the certificate of Patterson and Willis, that Miller refused to give a certificate, is one evidence that he knew that the statement which they say he made was false. They admit that he is a partisan of Mr. Clay. If he had told the truth, he would not have hesitated, when called upon, to give this certificate, as an act of justice to the printer, whose publication had been denied. But the letter of Mr. Patterson bears internal evidence of falsehood. The disgusting detail of electioneering slang about the Presidential election, which it is pretended passed between General Jackson and this Doctor Miller, could not have taken place, because Gen. Jackson is not in the

habit of conversing upon that subject with his particular friends, much less then would he do it with a stranger in a steam-boat. The bar-room scene too, is false, because so far from inviting a stranger to drink with him, so abstemious is Gen. Jackson, that he drinks *water* only, and his acquaintances know this, and know that even at public dinner parties, he does not even drink wine.

Another part of the tale discredits Mr. Patterson still more. He concludes his letter by saying—"I again went on board the boat, thinking that I might hear him (General Jackson) speak on the subject, but he was engaged in playing cards, and I left the boat without hearing him say any thing about Clay or his pamphlet."

Now who can believe this? The steam boat Pocahontas touched at the mouth of Cumberland for a few minutes only. The populace on the shore were crowding in; the anxiety of all to see General Jackson was natural, and his courtesy led him to treat every one of them with politeness—that he should at such a time, and under such circumstances, sit down to play cards, is not to be believed. No one who has ever travelled in a steamboat can believe it. But when it is known that Gen. Jackson *does not, at any time, play cards*—the baseness of this whole affair is more manifest.

Neither does General Jackson swear.

So much of this statement as relates to Gen. Jackson's usual habits of temperance, and the fact that he does not swear or play cards, is made upon the authority of members of Congress from the State of Tennessee, who particularly are acquainted with Gen. Jackson, and who know his habits to be such as we have stated them.—Wretched, indeed, are the shifts to which the coalition are driven, to retain their ill obtained power. By them truth is trampled under foot, and many and various falsehoods asserted with most unblushing effrontery.

MR. CALHOUN

The Vice President yesterday, in consequence of some remarks which fell from the two Senators from Indiana, took occasion to state more explicitly and at large, his views in relation to to the subject of Internal Improvement. So fully satisfied was Mr. Barton of the propriety of Mr. Calhoun's vote upon this subject, and particularly on the propriety and consistency of his vote on the Illinois Canal bill, that he, with candor declared his opinion of the correctness of Mr. Calhoun's conduct, on that occasion.

We consider this decision of the Senate upon this subject of great importance, and in justice to those who have participated in the debate, will endeavour in a few days to give it at length. In the mean time as the letter writers of the coalition make a business of misrepresentations, we give the remarks of the Vice-President, addressed to the Senate on Wednesday, when called to give the casting vote, limiting the surveys:

The Vice President said,

"If the system of Internal Improvement cannot be confined, in practice, to objects really of national importance, as contemplated by the act of 1824; and if it must degenerate into those merely local, having no reference to the powers and duties of the general government, it would, and ought, to fall into disrepute. Such had always been his opinion. When the first act making appropriations for surveys passed, he filled the office of Secretary of War; and acting on the principle that no road or canal which had not a direct relation to some one or all of the powers of the government, as stated in the act, he deemed it his first duty, in carrying its provisions into effect, to designate, on fixed principles, the objects which, on full deliberation appeared to be comprehended within its provisions, which were reported to Congress at the next session. The object in making the report, was to make fully known to Congress the views of the Department, in the execution of a trust of so high and delicate a character, to the end, if approved by them, the system might assume some definite form, which might regulate future operations in its execution, and place the whole subject more under the direct control of the Legislative powers of the Government.

With such principles, I cannot hesitate to give my casting vote in favor of the amendment reported by the Committee of Finance. By completing the surveys already commenced, and laying the whole before Congress, with an estimate of the expense, it is hoped that some principle may be fixed in making appropriations for surveys hereafter, and thereby, if possible, arrest the liability to abuse from the nature of the subject, which, if not guarded against must end in the overthrow of the whole system.

MR. SUTHERLAND'S AMENDMENT TO THE TARIFF.

In the House of Representatives, on Saturday last, after many propositions for amendment had been been made and rejected, the question was finally taken upon Mr. Sutherland's amendment in connexion with Mr. Mallary's, and was adopted as part of the bill, by a vote of 183 to 17. It is proper to remark here, that some of the amendments tendered for the consideration of the House, were looked at in a very friendly light, and if they had been judiciously prepared, might have received the approbation of a majority of the Representatives of the nation. But their want of system, and the importance of the changes contemplated in the Custom House regulations, by the provisions presented for concurrence, rendered it inexpedient, at so advanced a stage in the session, to endanger the passage of the bill by their adoption. There seems to be a prevailing disposition on the part of the House to urge the bill to its final reading with as little delay as possible. By the adoption of Mr. Sutherland's proposition, the *wool* and *woollens* portion of the tariff has been *settled*. The duty upon molasses will doubtless be debated to day. And as there are but few points of difference upon the other branches of the bill, it is quite probable, it will not require much time to put an end to the discussion.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*,

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, APRIL 19, 1828. No. 6.

The subscribers to the Extra Telegraph, will receive number six in anticipation of number five. Number five will be put to press in anticipation of its regular time. We have had many complaints, and some apprehensions have been excited, because the second number did not follow in regular time after the publication of the first. We have already given one reason for this, which we will repeat. The publication of this paper was an experiment; we knew that it would necessarily interfere much with the circulation of other weekly papers in the country, and although we had received many acts of kindness from the editors of such papers, with whom we exchange, we had no right to anticipate their active and disinterested efforts to make our project known to the public, and to obtain subscribers for us. We knew that, if the project met with the public approbation, we should receive large additional subscriptions, and it was desirable to know public sentiment, that we might strike off a sufficient number to supply those who may hereafter subscribe. The manufacturer who was to to have supplied us with paper, failed to do so, and we were under the necessity of sending New York for it. We received, in the mean time, such encouragement, that we have worked off an edition of twenty thousand copies, which enables us to supply, to that extent, new subscribers with all the numbers from the beginning.

When it is considered that this publication will give upwards of five hundred pages of closely printed matter, and that it is intended to collect in it the most able and interesting documents and publications which the present contest shall bring forth, the Editors do not hesitate to say, that it will form one of the most valuable and cheap books, that a friend of General Jackson can purchase.

To the editors of newspapers, it will furnish an important book of reference, now and hereafter. Grateful for the aid which we have received from our fellow-laborers, we intend to send, without charge, a copy in addition to our regular exchange, to each publisher of a newspaper who will regularly acknowledge the receipt of each number, and publish a table of its contents.

An esteemed correspondent writes to us, that the failure of the regular receipt of the second number had given rise to much speculation to our prejudice, and that it was currently reported, that we had failed, and unable to continue the work. We have not failed. We now publish regularly, each week, about *forty thousand* newspapers. We have *five* newspaper presses, and often run them with double sets of hands, day and night. This operation is one of great expense. As yet, we have executed but little printing from the press, (not one-fourth part as much, we believe, as has been ordered by the House,) but we have fixed our hopes upon the people—we look to them to contribute the means to sustain us and *their* press. We know that they are double taxed---that whilst they contribute to us *directly*, they contribute *indirectly* to our opponents. But there is this difference: What they give to us, is a voluntary contribution for the purpose of driving from office those who have abused their trust, and used the public money to purchase venal presses to abuse the people's candidate.

Desiring to give the following an extensive circulation, we have inserted it in the *extra*, and invite for it a attentive perusal. It is an ample vindication of the Committee on Manufactures from the *Honorable* slander to which it is a reply.

THE REAL STATE OF THE CASE REVIEWED.

The following publication appeared two days since in the folding rooms of the House of Representatives, and has been from thence issued, by honorable Members of Congress, to the country in thousands. It may be supposed, that even a review of this sad attempt to deceive the people in relation to the course of the Administration, and its friends in the House of Representatives, as to the Tariff, is of itself a suspicion of the intelligence of the enlightened agriculturists of this country. But no such inference should be drawn. The writer well knows the *ability* of every free man to understand his own rights, as well as his *disposition* to defend them; and he has always *felt* that the farmers of this country are its safe-guards against tyranny, against aristocracy, and against MONOPOLY, the great engine by which alone either aristocracy or tyranny can be sustained among and over a free people. But it is no impeachment to the intelligence of our farmers to suppose that they cannot know the conduct of their representatives at the seat of government, or the events as they actually transpire, in relation to any measure before Congress; unless there shall be honesty enough in the land to give them the information as it is. The publication now to be reviewed, professes to be made with that intention, and the object of the writer shall be to see if it is honest, and does, in truth, give "the real state of the case," or if it has been made from a lying spirit, and with the sole intention to deceive and mislead the public.

The publication is as follows:

"TO THE PEOPLE.

THE REAL STATE OF THE CASE.

It seems to us to be high time that the People should understand the true situation of the question, respecting an increased protection on WOOL and WOOLLEN GOODS, now pending in the House of Representatives

Argument is exhausted; and there is, after all, very great reason to fear, *that nothing but an imperative expression of public opinion will cause any measure, whatever, on this subject, to be passed at the present session.*

The real and sober *truth* is—That a Jackson member was elected SPEAKER, at the commencement of the session;

That the Speaker, by the rules of the House, appoints all Committees;

That on the Committee of Manufactures, he appointed Mr. MALLARY, Mr. STEVENSON, of Pa., Mr. CONDICT, Mr. MOORE, of Ky., Mr. STANBERRY, Mr. WRIGHT, of New York, and Mr. MARTIN;

That FIVE, out of these SEVEN members of the Committee, viz: Messrs. Stevenson, Moore, Wright, Stanberry, and Martin, are open and avowed friends of General Jackson;

That Mr. Mallary and Mr. Condict, and they alone of the Committee, are friends of the Administration;

That Mr. Mallary and Mr. Condict, were members of the last Congress, and both voted for, and supported the WOOLLENS BILL, of the last session;

That Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Moore were also of the last Congress, and both voted *against* that bill;

That Mr. Wright, of New York, (not of Ohio,) and Mr. Martin, and Mr. Stanberry, are new members, and are all three Jackson men; and the two last named gentlemen are understood to be decidedly against a protecting tariff;

That the bill now before the House, was reported by this Committee; and that of the Committee, FIVE members, viz: the *five friends of General Jackson*, agreed to the bill; and Mr. Mallary and Mr. Condict, the two Administration members, were *against* it;

That the bill thus reported, was therefore the production of *one friend* of the *woollen interest*, Mr. Wright, aided by *four opponents* of that interest, viz: Messrs. Stevenson, Moore, Stanberry, and Martin;

That the provisions of this bill are such, in the opinion of the most intelligent farmers and manufacturers, that no rational can be expected to vote for it; these manufacturers and wool growers all agree, that this bill would injure both. This is the language of those interested, from New Hampshire to Washington, and from the sea to the Mississippi;

That it imposes so heavy a duty on cheap, coarse wool, such as we do not raise in this country, as must entirely break up all the manufactures of carpets, negro cloths, and other coarse fabrics;

That this enormous duty on imported coarse wool, is obviously designed to catch the support of the farming interest; while all well informed wool growers know, that the manufacturers above alluded to must use this cheap imported wool, or stop their factories; and that, if they stop, then, of course, there will be *no market* for their own wool at any price;

That the very high duties on molasses, and some other articles, were obviously inserted for the purpose of giving the bill such a character as that the Northern and Eastern members could not vote for it;

the measure altogether; second, to throw its defeat on the friends of the Administration;

That Mr. Mallary has moved, and the motion is now pending, to amend the bill by striking out all that part of it which relates to wool and woollens, and inserting, instead thereof, *the recommendation of the Harrisburgh Convention*, as to those articles;

That this motion has been under discussion three weeks, and is strenuously opposed by the Jackson members, both of the Committee and the House:

That there is very great danger that this motion will be defeated *by a union of all those Southern members who are against all protection whatever, and the Jackson members, from Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and New York, who, although they profess to be in favor of protecting the farmers and manufacturers, yet vote on all occasions and with unwavering steadiness, with their Southern Jackson friends.* That, therefore, it is probable that the bill cannot be amended so as to answer any good purpose, either to the wool grower or the manufacturer, or be rendered other than ruinous to both. And that as neither the friends of the wool grower nor of the manufacturer, can conscientiously vote for it, in its present shape, little hope remains of getting any bill whatever through the House."

That a Speaker of the House of Representatives was elected, at the commencement of the present session of Congress, friendly to General Jackson, is true; and that he was elected by the unbiassed voice of the representatives of a free people, coming fresh from their constituents, and feeling their direct responsibility, over the *prostituted* candidate of a base coalition, and by a large majority, is equally true;

That that Speaker, by the rules of the House, appoints the Standing Committees is true; and that, being himself an anti-tariff man, because his constituents are all anti-tariff men, he did appoint the Committee named: *six*, out of the seven of whom are friends to the tariff and to the protecting system, is just as true;

That five members of the Committee are the friends of General Jackson as against John Quincy Adams, is true; and that Mr. Mallary and Dr. Condict, "and they alone of the Committee," are friends of the Administration, and that in their course upon the tariff they act as the *friends* of the *Administration*, and not as the *friends* of the PEOPLE, will hereafter be seen.

The writer has not looked at the votes of the members of the Committee *upon the celebrated Woollens Bill* of the last winter, because he considers it perfectly immaterial how those votes stood; yet he is willing to admit the truth to be as stated in the publication, inasmuch as the bill has received the condemnation of the *farmers* of the country, as well as the authoritative condemnation, and by an almost unanimous vote, of the Legislatures of some of the largest and most populous, as well as most wealthy *and most agricultural* States in this Union; and within the last few days has received the condemnation of the Administration members of the House of Representatives themselves.

That Mr. Stanberry, of the committee, [illegible]

"That the Tariff bill now before the House was reported by this Committee" is true; but that "*the five friends of General Jackson*" upon the Committee agreed to the bill is not true. Four of the "*friends of General Jackson*" and of "*a protecting tariff,*" upon the Committee did agree to it, and the *two friends of the Administration*, upon the Committee, together with the member of the Committee *known to be opposed to all protecting laws* of any kind whatsoever, "*were against it!*"

"That the bill thus reported" was the production of one friend and four opponents of the "*woollen interest*" is not true; but that it was the production of *four friends of the interest of WOOL and Woollens*, against the exertions of *one anti-tariff* and *two Administration* men, is true.

Whether this bill, thus formed and thus reported, is such, "in the opinion of the most intelligent farmers and manufacturers, that *no rational man* can be expected to vote for it;" whether "these manufacturers and wool growers *all agree*, that this bill would injure both," the writer would respectfully suggest, are questions yet to be determined by the grand inquest of Farmers and Manufacturers of the country. That "this is the language of those interested, from New Hampshire to Washington, and from the sea to the Mississippi," *is not true.* See the resolutions of the Legislature of N. York, saying expressly that the *woollens bill* of the last winter *did not furnish adequate protection* to WOOL: the resolutions of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, urging further protection to domestic spirits, wool, iron, hemp, flax, &c. the resolutions of the Legislature of Ohio, urging substantially the same thing: the proceedings of a numerous public meeting of Manufacturers and other citizens held at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, the greatest manufacturing town in the country, on the 22d of March last, resolving unanimously, that the provisions of this bill are suited to their interests, and urging its passage: See also the thousand Petitions and Memorials now before Congress: and last, though not least, see the *sworn testimony*, not of the farmers (for no farmers were called to say what their interests required) but of the MANUFACTURERS THEMSELVES, and which proves that the bill is sufficient.

But what would these two *Administration men* upon the Committee have done for WOOL and *woollens?* This is answered by *Mr. Mallary's* motion to amend the bill, and which has now *been rejected*, by a vote of 102 to 78.

His motion, as made, *and as rejected*, and the same motion referred to in this publication as then pending, and of the rejection of which the publication says, "there is very great danger," did what for wool?

It did not propose to raise the duty at all upon wool costing 8 cents per pound and under, in a foreign market, although more than 2,000,000 lbs. of that wool were imported *for the use of the Woollen Manufacturers* during the last year.

It did propose to lay a duty of 2.5 *cents* per pound upon wool, costing more than 8 cents in a foreign market.

What was this doing for the farmer and wool grower?

The present duty upon wool is 30 per cent. ad valorem; or, in the manner of valuing duties, 33 cents upon every $1 worth of wool.

A pound of wool, then, costing in a foreign market $1, would, by the present law, pay a duty of 33 cents; if Mr. Mallary's proposition had been adopted, the same pound of wool would have paid 20 cents, or 13 *cents less duty than it now pays.*

This, then, is what *Mr. Mallary* and *Dr. Condict*, the two *Administration Members* of the Committee would have done for the *farmer who raises wool.* This is "*the real and sober truth.*"

But if they would diminish the duty on wool, what would they do for the woollen manufacturer?

Again, Mr. Mallary's proposition, *which has been rejected*, answers the question.

It proposed to make,

A yard of cloth costing 20 cents, pay 22 cents duty.

A yard of cloth costing 60 cents, pay $1 19 cents duty.

A yard of cloth costing $2 60 cents, pay $1 76 cents duty.

A yard of cloth, costing $4 10 cents, pay $2 64 cents duty.

Thus the lowest yard of cloth which could be bought, made of wool, was to pay a greater duty than the finest pound of wool, which any foreign country could produce, although wool is now actually imported which sells in our market at $1 65 per pound. This could only be effected by an actual *reduction* of the present duty upon wool, and that was resorted to, notwithstanding these enormous duties upon cloths; notwithstanding the fact, that the wool is worth but half the value of the cloth it makes; and notwithstanding the lowest possible duty, proposed by Mr. Mallary, upon woollen cloths, is 44 cents upon every dollar of value.

This too "is the real sober truth," and this is the relative *kindness* and *protection* offered by these members of the Committee, and supported by the administration members of Congress, to the farmers and to the manufacturers of the country.

But what did the *four "friends of General Jackson"* and of "*a protecting tariff,*" propose to do by the bill which they "agreed to!?"

Let the *friends of the administration* answer, in the following recital of facts.

But a few days since, Mr. Buchanan of Pennsylvania, offered a proposition in relation to wool and woollens, the effect of which was to increase the present duty upon wool from 30 per cent. (what it now is) to 50 per cent.; and to increase the present duty upon woollen cloths from 33½ per cent. (what it now is) to 50 per cent., and placing the rates of duty, both *upon wool* and upon *woollen goods*, at the same standard. The effect of this would be to make the duty upon woollen goods, just double what it would be upon wool, because the wool entering into a yard of cloth is only half as valuable as the cloth when made. Thus 50 cents worth of wool would make a yard of cloth worth $1 00. The duty upon the wool would be 50 per cent. upon 50 cents equal to 25 cents. The duty upon the cloth would be 50 per cent. upon $1 00 equal to 50 cents.

This proposition was opposed by *Mr. Mallary*, Mr. Dwight, of Massachusetts, Mr. Davis, of Massachusetts, and others, in speeches, on the ground that the duty on wool was too high, and that the duty on cloths was not high enough to correspond with the duty on wool; and by Mr. Storrs, of New York, expressly upon the ground *that it did not afford as much protection to the manufacturer* as the bill reported by the Committee. The *Administration men* voted against it, and, united with the anti-tariff votes of the South, rejected it.

Here, therefore, is the official declaration of these *political tariff men*, that the bill reported by the Committee, so far as it relates to *wool and woollens*, had *done more* than to increase the duty on wool directly, from 30 to 50 per cent., and more for woollen cloths than to increase the duty upon them, from 33 1-3 to 50 per cent., an increase of 16 2-3 cents upon every dollar of value, and *therefore was to be preferred to such a proposed increase, as it was preferred by them in voting upon it.*

Such then is the bill which "no rational man can be expected to vote for!" Such is the bill, which the "manufacturers all agree" *would injure both*, if this publication contains the truth.

But the bill reported by the Committee does more. It proposes an increase of duty upon *iron*, an article of prime national importance; and these *Eastern tariff men are opposed to that.*

It proposes an increase of duty upon *hemp*, to enable our farmers to grow it without a loss; and the *Administration tariff men are opposed to that.* It helps the farmer too much, they say.

It proposes a duty upon *imported flax*, to enable our farmer to sell his flax in our markets; *and they are opposed to that duty.*

It proposes an increase of duty upon *imported spirits and molasses*, to enable our farmers, and particularly of the Western and Middle States, to find a market for their coarse grains, by converting them into domestic spirits, without having these spirits driven from our own markets by the foreign spirits, or by the *New England rum* made from imported molasses; and this, together with the foregoing duties on iron, hemp, flax, &c. is what this publication says was "obviously inserted for the purpose of giving the bill such a character, *as that the Northern and EASTERN members could not vote for it.*"

These *Administration tariff men* are also *opposed to this duty.*

But what are they in favor of? Mr. Sprague, of Maine, upon a motion made by himself, to strike out of the bill the proposed duty *upon hemp, upon sail duck*, and *upon molasses*, has answered the question, in a labored speech, against any duty upon these articles, upon iron, and virtually upon wool, and really avowing that their *tariff patriotism* is only extended to woollen cloths. He has been seconded by Mr. Ingersoll, of Massachusetts, and even by Mr. Bryant, of North Carolina, an Administration member from that State, and by Mr. Reed, of Massachusetts.

Farmers of the country, is this the tariff you want, without any protection to your interests?

But says this publication, "the whole proceeding is apparently designed to produce two second, *to throw its defeat on the friends of the Administration.*"

Honest, sincere tariff men! Thus early to be able to predict the loss of their own virtue; thus early to be able to forte! their final opposition to the tariff! And why? Because there is a duty on *wool*, as well as a duty on *woollens;* because there is a duty on Iron, on Hemp, on Flax, &c. In short because the bill, reported by the Committee, was formed by the friends of General Jackson *against* the consent of the friends of Mr. Adams; because it offers protection to *farmers* and to other manufacturers, as well as to the *manufacturers of wool.* Because it will not, if passed, answer the *political purposes* of the present administration.

Let the people of the country, *the farmers*, the iron masters and others, *particularly*, look to it. Let them say who are, and who are not, *in practice*, opposed *to just and equal protection.*

Who are the "MANY," by whom this publication is issued to the world? They are the political leaders of this administration at the seat of government.

Let the foregoing facts be denied, or let these political friends of a *political Tariff* answer to a member of the Committee on Manufactures, whose name is at the service of any gentleman.

Congressional.

ACCOUNTING OFFICERS OF THE TREASURY.

Mr. J. S. BARBOUR, of Va. moved the consideration of the following resolution, offered by him on the 12th ultimo.

"*Resolved*, That provision ought to be made for excluding the agency of the President in appointing the principal disbursing and accounting officers of the Treasury Department, and that the power of appointing them should be vested in Congress."

The motion for consideration having prevailed—

Mr. BARBOUR modified his resolution, so as to read as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That provision ought to be made for excluding the agency of the President in the appointment of the principal disbursing and accounting officers of the Treasury Department, and that to this end, the Constitution of the U. States should be amended.

2. *Resolved*, That so much of any existing law as empowers the President to remove, at pleasure, and without the concurrence of the Senate, the principal disbursing and accounting officers of the Treasury, ought to be repealed.

Mr. J. S. BARBOUR said: My purpose, Mr. Speaker, in bringing this subject to the view of the House, is to invite its attention to the propriety of breaking up the existing dependency of the principal officers of the Treasury, on the Chief Executive Magistrate. The purity of these functionaries will be best preserved, by putting them as far apart as practicable. Placing them in contact, is, in itself, a measure full of danger to the wholesome principle of official responsibility. But this absolute dependence of the one on the other, is totally

straints, which constitute the surest pledges for fidelity to duty. No error was of more prevailing influence, at the period when the Constitution was adopted, than the imagined weakness of the executive department. Time has not only dispelled all apprehension of its feebleness in action, but has also confirmed to us its native vigor, and its inherent tendency to draw to itself the constitutional powers of co-ordinate departments. In the outset of our new plans of political institution, there was a pervading sentiment of jealousy in constituting executive power. This was the natural effect of causes in which our revolution and dismemberment from Great Britain originated. And these operated with irresistible dominion, in those forms of State government which were established soon after that event. In a very few years, however, this distrust gave way to opposite inclinations; and we passed from the one extreme to the other. And hence, in our existing Constitution, the fruits of the change are manifest and alarming. The appointing power is among the richest endowments of executive prerogative. It brings within the active and controlling sphere of its influence, the best and the worst passions of human nature. In its original grant, this prerogative was sufficiently large and authoritative. Yet in the practical operations of the system, it has been greatly augmented. In the commencement, the Senate was relied upon as a safeguard against abuse—but the legislature having granted to the executive head the sole power of displacing all officers, such grant removes this safeguard, by conferring on the President, singly, an authority of unlimited influence. If the constitutional power to appoint be a rich and most attractive prerogative, the legal power of displacing at pleasure, must also be considered a most efficient and subduing agency. The first will act upon the passions of pride, avarice and ambition; but in the operation of the last, there will be superadded to these powerful incitements, mortification, the fear of shame and disgrace, and the dreaded penalties, perhaps, of unmerited odium. The hand that grasps these powers holds uncontrolled dominion over these dependents of Executive will, by the moral sway of hope and fear, reward and punishment. Is such depositary safe? Is it necessary to the great objects of constitutional establishment? The obligations of Executive duty imposed upon the President, call for large grants of power, appropriate to the just ends of their fulfilment. The appointing power is most extensive. It was necessary to lodge it some where, and in its general exercise I would not disturb it. Not because it is an authority unassociated with great means of doing great mischief, but because it is indissolubly connected with the high responsibilities of the Executive trust. And the power to do wrong is an essential and integral part of the ability to do right. But, Mr. Speaker, when we contemplate this power to appoint and displace at will, in association with the peculiar situation and duties of the principal accounting and disbursing officers of the Treasury, new questions press themselves into the inquiry, and (more especially in estimating its relation to the various allotments of constitutional power) other considerations claim our serious attention.

The public treasure is placed in the keeping and under the exclusive control of Congress. It is intrusted, in an eminent degree, to the providence and thrift of this House: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." Moreover, the power of Congress itself is limited, in making appropriations for the army, to the term of two years; and it is further provided, by our constitutional code, "that all bills for raising revenue, shall originate in the House of Representatives." More explicit enactments, conferring and limiting authority, could not have been invented. The power of raising revenue and directing the expenditure of money, is a high representative and legislative trust. Among our correlative duties is the stewardship of its disbursement. To ensure fidelity, and secure accountability, the agents exercising this derivative trust of expending the public funds, should owe all responsibility to that branch of the government constitutionally clothed with the right of appropriation, and the absolute power of taxation. If abuse or corruption now exist, those who hold the purse strings are without the means of detection or punishment. The persons engaged in the practical agency of disbursement, should not be dependent on the abusing power. Fidelity in office is most certain when the passion of self-interest is made to coincide with integrity and rectitude. In what does virtue itself consist, but a compromise of opposite motives and inducements? I speak of no particular administration—of no particular man or class of men, but of human nature comprehensively. Does any man live, untainted by original sin? How can we rationally expect to detect fraud in public disbursement, or malfeasance in any part of the Treasury establishment, so long as every disbursing and accounting officer (for such from the nature of things are the only efficient witnesses of public delinquency) are dependent for their official existence upon the very power that is interested in concealing its own corrupt conduct? Does the general and intangible responsibility of the Chief Magistrate afford adequate security against this mischief? Supposing such dangers should impend—I perceive under our existing system no effectual remedy. On the contrary, I know of no political error more prevalent in its influence, or more detrimental to the public welfare, than this vague notion of responsibility. It constitutes neither the distinguishing nor the conservative principle of our system. Responsibility had been seen, felt and illustrated in all the forms of government which preceded ours. Even in the sternest despotisms, it was the sword of Damocles suspended over the head of Tyranny. In our parent country, in the worst age of the race of her worst princes, it brought the head of one of the Stuarts to the block, and drove another from the throne. Sir, I will repeat, what I said upon another occasion, that limitation of power, defined in express written grant, is not only the great and saving principle of our Constitution, but it is the prominent developement in the political discovery of the age. If we have any sheet-anchor for the national ship, it is this. Responsibility, commonly inoperative and easily evaded, looks to the punishment of offences only. Limitation of power,

rests on the surer basis of preventive justice; controls the public functionary, arrests the mad career of profligate ambition, and checks the centripetal tendency of the system.

The subdivision and restrictions of granted power, first in being parcelled out among our State and confederate governments, and next distributed into the three co-ordinate departments of each, with express limitations upon all, constitute the improved and prominent invention of this age. To these, responsibility in the agency which administers our institutions may be added. Yet its action is but secondary. Or if I may employ a word just used by my worthy colleague, Mr. RANDOLPH, it is ancillary to a greater, primary restraint. It is the handmaid only of a more efficient conservative of popular liberty. In practice (upon a large part of the expenditures of this government,) the restraining and supervising power of Congress is lost. This is not a transient evil of the hour, but one that has been constantly expanding, until its shade is now cast over most of the objects for which public treasure is disbursed. Enormous as the patronage of the Executive undoubtedly is, its prerogative is yet more serious and alarming. The practical operation of things, at present, is to substitute, to a vast extent, the President's prerogative, as a supplement to the legislative will. It puts aside the excellent provision of the Constitution, which exacts appropriations by law for all money drawn from the treasury, and substitutes *executive discretion as the only guide and warrant of expenditure*. Sir, the first appropriation bill that ever passed Congress, was for $639,000; that for the last year, exclusive of the public debt, was somewhat less than thirteen millions. In the first three years of the present Constitution, the consolidated revenues of the treasury were not above four million and a half of dollars. Three years of the receipts of the present times would equal seventy-five millions. Few Governments have held possession of large amounts in treasure, without finding adequate means and purposes for disbursing it. And the suggestion is as applicable to ours, as to any other Government. But our greatest danger appears to result from the heavy appropriations for contingencies, and other undefined objects of public expenditure, wherein the unrestricted discretion of the Executive exerts an absolute dominion. These have been creeping upon us year after year, till at length the mind is startled at the enormity of the sum. Mr. Jefferson foresaw and warned Congress, that this might become the matrix of unnumbered ills; entreating that specific appropriations might always be made. In the first year of his Administration, reform was difficult. There was a government to re-organize, and an army to disband; foreign relations to adjust upon new developments of public opinion; reform and economy to supersede existing prodigality and abuse: Such and so many objects required a large investment of discretionary authority. Yet, even in this embarrassed state of public affairs, and environed by requisitions that seemed to plead for enlarged Executive discretion, the sum that year appropriated for contingencies, did not exceed sixty thousand dollars, and the sum total that could be reached by the greatest stretch of this authority, was about one hundred and twenty thousand dollars. In the following year, when sagacity, enlightened by experience, enabled him to bring into practice the desired virtues of economy and reform, this class of appropriations was reduced to about twenty thousand dollars. And in the year succeeding, pressing his principles still further into useful service, the amount of the contingent funds a little exceeded fifteen thousand dollars. I have with some care, Mr. Speaker, run through the appropriation bills for the service of the last year, and collating these with such information as I was able to extract from the Treasury Department, and having thereupon made an estimate of the whole amount of money subject to the untrammelled will of the President, I greatly err if this amount *be not two millions of dollars*. The alarming magnitude of such a trust appears imminently hazardous to the morality and safety of our institutions. It is in effect abrogating that wholesome check of the Constitution which prohibits the drawing of any money from the Treasury, except by virtue of appropriation made by law. It invests the executive will with a dangerous authority over that trust, which the Constitution for wise purposes confided to Congress. It makes a mockery of the strongest barrier against executive influence, and the encroachment of a single magistrate; and in so far removing the vigilant guardianship of the representative body, dispenses with a large portion of its appropriate responsibility. Sir, in a country so extensive and extending as ours, with great and growing interests, continually becoming more diversified, an immense trust may perhaps be unavoidable. Legal specifications more precise may be impracticable. But if this be so, surely it offers an irrepressible motive with us for some suitable measure of reform and change. If so great a trust be indispensable, in proportion to its magnitude and necessity should be the care and vigilance with which the Legislature ought to guard it from every abuse. Let us put around our treasury, sentinels for its security, actuated by such inducements to fidelity as may promise a proper result. Let us connect the interest of the man we trust with his powers and his duties. Is the case so at present? Are not your accounting and disbursing agents so dependent upon the good will of the Chief Magistrate, that they are brought necessarily to stand in conflict with fidelity to the people? It is vain theory to hope that written forms of duty will prevail against the impulses of self preservation. Money is the great lever of ambition, and when did ambition forbear, in operating upon the frailty of human nature, to use the means best adapted to its ends? Over such delicate trusts can we plant too many guards?

The time for the discussion having expired, on a subsequent day, Mr. BARTLETT, of New Hampshire, and Mr. STORRS, of New York, addressed the House in reply to Mr. BARBOUR—after which,

Mr. BARBOUR said, the gentleman from New York demands a moment's attention before I proceed to reply to the gentleman from New Hampshire. This gentleman [Mr. STORRS] seems to possess a creative faculty for raising shadows, and to employ it, that he may combat them. The resolutions now submitted indicate

an existing evil, but they do not point out the remedy. In that task, alike difficult and important, I hope for all the aid which the wisdom of the House can give me. And this fiction of the gentleman's fancy is pressed upon us with a manner of apparent earnestness. He affects to think that the action of our system tends to augment the power of this House. Such suggestions are at least as old as our present form of government. For it was contemporaneously asserted that the tendency of Republics is to augment the power of the popular branch of the government, at the expense of the co-ordinate departments, but of Monarchies to enlarge the executive allotments of power. If such be the tendency and test of political institutions, I fear that the general principle of monarchy, rather than of democracy, is implanted in our own. If this test is to be found in the results, who can fail to remark the ample and growing influence of the executive; while that of its co-ordinate branches is progressively diminishing. Can any rational observer deny that the creation and action of the executive are the pivots upon which our general system is turning? Not only the divisions of party in this House, but our foreign and domestic policy revolve upon them. Is there any thing in the creation or in the action of the representative departments of either the State or Federal Governments that is not touched in some point by popular prejudice, or partiality for the executive magistrate of the Union? And why, Sir, is this so? The answer is obvious; and we find it in the augmented powers, patronage, and prerogatives of the President. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Bartlett] has counselled me to correct my errors, in stating as I have done, the public expenditure by recurrence to Treasury reports. I wish, Sir, that I had found correct counsel in the gentleman's example rather than his precept. In attempting to correct my imputed mistakes, the gentleman himself has certainly been betrayed into palpable error. He was wrong in his commencement, and errors are diffused throughout the whole financial view that he has presented. We are informed by him, that the power of transferring without limit, specific appropriations, was coeval with the government; that prior to 1809, it never had been restrained; and consequently, that the discretion of the President ranged over the whole expenditure of the Treasury. The gentleman has confounded the grant of this power with what he has told us was its first limitation. Can it be possible, that with common sense for his guide, and the Constitution of the country staring him in the face, that he can really have arrived at this conclusion. The gentleman cannot have looked into this subject, or he surely would have seen that salutary check upon the executive which the Constitution imposes, in the provision that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

His mind labors in its own delusion, by misapprehending the first legislative grant for the first legislative restriction: and this is an irrefragable answer to so much of the gentleman's estimates, as embraces three millions of dollars. Prior to Mr. Jefferson's administrations, the language of our appropriation acts was loose and general. He saw the means of mischief that crowded around this practice, and in his first message advised its change. Specific appropriations to definite objects followed, and his model of economy and simplicity in administration, is happily illustrated, in this respect, by its strict coherence to the plain principles of the constitution. In process of time, these views gave way to a misguiding exigency, and the spirit of the constitution was subdued in the act of March 3d, 1809. The right to transfer appropriations, defeats that guard over the public money which the constitution designed for its security, and gives into the hand of the President the key that unlocks, at his will, the national treasures. This was, no doubt, a temporary convenience: but it was fraught with serious error in its inception, and still more serious danger in the precedent. The present Vice-President of the United States moved upon this floor in December 1816, the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee of Ways and "Means be instructed to inquire into the expe- "diency of repealing so much of an act entitled "an act further to amend the several acts for "the establishment and regulation of the Trea- "sury, War and Navy Departments, passed 3d "March 1809, as authorizes the President of "the United States to transfer appropriations."

Although powerfully resisted in debate, he succeeded in this effort to bring back the executive action to its constitutional limits. Had he no other claims to public gratitude but this single act of replacing the constitution upon its true and original basis, it would be of itself sufficient to give him a high and just rank among the benefactors of his country. The act of March 3d, 1817, was the fruit of his exertions. That of May 1820 next followed. By this last act, the power of transfer, which is equivalent to the grant of absolute power over disbursement, was vested in the President, for the following specified objects:—"For the subsistence of the Army, for forage, for the Medical and Hospital Department;" also in the Navy Department; "for provisions, for medicines, and hospital stores, for repairs of vessels, for clothing." And this act concludes by prohibiting all other transfer of appropriation. As the gentleman has called in question the accuracy of my first estimate of the sums subject to the will of the President, I have revised it upon his own admitted basis of calculation. If I am in error, that error is incurable, for I have spared no diligence in the scrutiny by which I tested the correctness of the original estimate. Sir, I must repeat that the contingent expenses for the first year of Mr. Jefferson's administration, though open to some cavil, should be fairly set down at $68,213, 57 cents, but embracing both enumerated and unenumerated contingencies, will not exceed $120,000; for the second year the amount was $20,350; and for the third year was $15,001, 2 cents. Contrasted with these, the appropriations for the last year, that are under the dominion of the executive, may be set down at two millions and fifty-six thousand, one hundred and fifty-three dollars and forty-eight cents. We may with propriety add to this sum, the appropriations for internal as well as external commerce; comprising the sums allotted for light-houses, buoys, piers, &c. &c.

which touch the latter subject, and roads, canals and surveys as connected with the former. For in these disbursements, the power conferred is so general, and the application of money in the legislative act, so loose and undefined, as necessarily to confide the expenditure to the executive judgment, as a supplement to the expressed will of the Legislature.

For these purposes there was last year expended, eight hundred and fourteen thousand two hundred and four dollars and fifty-two cents, and which added to the above amount of two millions fifty-six thousand one hundred and fifty-three dollars, and forty-eight cents, make a total of two millions eight hundred and seventy thousand three hundred and fifty-eight dollars. I am thoroughly persuaded that it will in the aggregate exceed, rather than fall short of, this computation. I have brought with me to my seat, the treasury reports, and extracts carefully taken from the acts of Congress making appropriation. [Here Mr. Barbour read from manuscripts, and other documents, in detail, each item of expenditure and appropriation.] It will be to me a source of gratification, if the gentleman from New Hampshire, or any other member will take these papers, or copies of them, and detect by the severest scrutiny, any error of estimate or calculation. Mr. Speaker, is it not a theme for curious and anxious speculation, that whenever any allusion is here made to the expenses of government, the friends of the Chief Magistrate rise up with their correlative estimates of the present and past administrations? And yet, Sir, this tremulous sensitiveness is by no means inexplicable. It is a fact, capable of the plainest demonstration, that the disbursements of public money, under like circumstances, and for the same objects of expenditure, by the present administration, have exceeded all former example. And it is not upon untenable ground that I make up this opinion. Arithmetical calculations, resting upon responsible reports from the Treasury Department, carry my mind to this confident conclusion. Whatever causes may arise for diversity of opinion upon other topics of inquiry, none can here exist; for the estimate of dollars and cents, by the plain use of figures, cannot conduct us into error, without the certainty of immediate and palpable detection. In the view that I took of this subject, my attention was fixed to the comparative estimate of appropriation and expenditure for the three years of this administration, compared with that of the three years immediately preceding it. And it presents the following results:

1822 Current expenditures exclusive of military pensions, and the payments to the public debt.		7,879,444 21	1825 Current expenditures exclusive of military pensions, and the payments to the public debt.		10,242,529 13
1823	Same	8,003,566 7	1826	Same	11,565,722 44
1824	Same	8,939,449 56	1827	Same	11,752,515 61
Total		$24,822,459 74	Total		$33,567,767 18

Deduct three years amount of preceding Administration	24,822,459 74
Showing an increase of disbursement in the present administration of	8,685,307 44

I have omitted any notice of the charges upon the Treasury, for the public debt, and the military pensions, because the payments to these objects cannot, by any dialectic ingenuity, be made the theme of eulogy to any administration. The extinguishing action of the sinking fund upon the public debt, cannot be set down to the credit of the executive. It results from pre-existing law. The excess of accumulation in the surplus fund, by operation of the same law, disgorges itself into the sinking fund, and becomes, in like manner, sacred to the public engagement. The appropriations for military pensions I have also excluded, because this is a disbursement likewise resting upon definite and uncontrollable causes, and is in no instance to be affected by administrative prodigality or economy. This channel of expenditure has been gradually contracting by the inflexible operation of the great law of nature, upon the aged survivors of the revolutionary army. I choose here to mention, that a slight difference may be made to appear in these calculations, if resort be had to the late report on the public debt. But this will present a stronger case, by five or six thousand dollars, against the present administration. I have made my deductions from the table accompanying the report of the Committee of Ways and Means, and sent to that Committee from the Treasury Department. I have taken that basis for calculation which presents the smallest discrepant amount of expenditure in the two periods embraced in the comparison. And here, too, Mr. Speaker, I entreat the gentleman from New Hampshire, [Mr. Bartlett,] to take these estimates, with the materials from which they have been made up, and give them his closest examination. They challenge and defy his scrutiny. The vaunted care and economy of this administration is opposed with the stubborn and melancholy fact, that eight millions six hundred and eighty-five thousand three hundred and seven dollars and forty-four cents have already been thriftlessly expended, instead of having been applied to the extinction of the public debt, since the present chief magistrate came into office. Sir, the evil does not stop here. It is said that we are enjoined by the constitutional duties which the distribution of power among the co-ordinate branches of government impose on us, to grant supplies. And the fact is unquestionable, that the executive estimates for the service of the current year, are at least equal, and in the main, probably greater, than for that which has closed. Pushing ahead for further results, in the supposititious *economy of this care-taking* administration, and judging of what is to be done, by that which has been done, I am warranted in saying that this excess of expenditure, beyond its comparative proportion, will be increased to eleven millions five hundred and eighty thousand four hundred and ten dollars and twenty-five cents. Is this to be borne with in a temper of patient forbearance? Can it be successfully controverted by any varying computation? Can it be palliated by any further disclosures of a justifying and imperative necessity? I am firmly convinced that it cannot.

The Treasury report, from which I have taken these expenditures, details for *each and every year, the same items of disbursement, identically and successively extended.* In the present condition of things, with a commerce suffering under exaction, and agriculture languishing into decay, have not our constituents (already burden-

ed with excessive though indirect taxes) a right to hold to us the chiding language of divine inspiration, and say: "we have labored, and other men have entered into the fruits of our labors." The gentleman from New Hampshire thought fit to claim credit to "the powers that be," because no appropriation had been asked at this time for the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse,—that is for the fund usually called "secret service money!" This is true, but it is accompanied by an odd development, that is equally true. For this fund, there was no appropriation asked or made during the years 1822 and 1823. For the year 1827, the unexpended balances of former appropriations had swelled to fifty-three thousand, one hundred dollars, and seventy-one cents. And yet a further appropriation of thirty thousand dollars was solicited and granted. And now when they have but forty-six thousand, eight hundred and forty-two dollars, placing under executive control between six and seven thousand dollars less than was wanted for the service of the last year; it is deemed sufficient, and no further appropriation is now asked. How, Sir, is this? As the gentleman has touched this expenditure I may be pardoned for doing so too. No trust can be more delicate than this. In comparing its disbursement with other proximate times, the following facts occur: From the first of January 1816, to the 4th of March 1817, when Mr. Madison retired from office, there was paid upon vouchers indicating secret service, but six hundred and fifty dollars. During the whole eight years of Mr. Monroe's Administration, there was paid in like manner, five thousand six hundred thirty dollars: While during two years and nine months of Mr. Adams's Administration, there has been expended ten thousand six hundred and twenty-four dollars and sixty-eight cents. Moreover, the sum of eight thousand nine hundred and fifty-eight dollars, [part of the above] was vouched for upon five different certificates, bearing dates the 8th and 21st November, 1827. This fund is legally designated for the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse, and yet I perceive that the sum of two thousand five hundred and forty-eight dollars and eighty-three cents was paid from this appropriation to *certain printers in the United States*, for advertising notice to Emigrants or Colonists of St. Domingo: a manifest departure from the express object of the appropriation. In contrast with this heavy, and as I think, unlawful use of the public money, I will mention the fact, that in the appropriation act of February 1802, is the item of eighty four dollars, for defraying the expenses of advertising the sale of public lands in the Sciota Gazette of Ohio. So cautious was Mr. Jefferson, that he would not touch even this small sum for an important service, without a specific grant by appropriation. The multiplication of offices with high salaries, in employing treaty bearing messengers, I consider a serious abuse. I find, that the aggregate sum including passage, expenses, pay, &c of nineteen hundred and forty dollars was paid to one messenger in 1825, for one hundred and twenty-six days, equalling $15 and 39 cents per day. A larger salary, for the time, than is given to the Chief Justice of the United Sates, and as much as is given to the head of a department. In the year 1826, there was paid in like manner, 1450 dollars 9½ cents, to another Messenger, for one hundred and thirty-two days, equal to 11 dollars 10 cents per day; and in 1827, to a third, 1250 dollars and 50 cents for one hundred and seven days, equal to 11 dollars 26 cents per day. Several others within the time were also employed. But I have taken these three cases to show, in successive years, the heavy wages paid for a service that calls for the exercise of no other talent than is common to every mail carrier of the country.

The suggestion, that these drains from the Treasury have been correspondent with legal appropriations, is no alleviation of this heavy expenditure. Power is not to be abused, because it may have been too confidingly trusted. In these delicate trusts, especially, over which there is an expanded and irresistible delegation of authority, we might expect an honorable sensitiveness, that instinctively recoils from all temptation to abuse. Every vestige of confidence, in the affairs of men, should be discarded, if we are at liberty to confound the distinctions of right and wrong, by extending the exercise of authority to the farthest limits of conceded power. If this be the case, we ought to banish from among us, that moral stability, which holds society together, and which constitutes the foundation of our political institutions. With all the precautions and limitations infused into the Constitution, it is manifest that the vice of our system is the expanding power of appropriating money, and its natural offspring —the large discretion lodged with the executive. As this usurped power is continually evading and surmounting its defined constitutional limits, so too is its subordinate result escaping from legal restraint. It is these incidents from incidents; imagined shadows of constructive shades, that have become more operative, and indeed more substantive too, than open and admitted powers. We can resist and combat what is known and palpable. It is secret and invisible agency, that is most to be dreaded. This will always be found most potent in action because it is neither to be seen nor touched. Silent accretions of authority, growing as it were, by stealth, are to be viewed with greatest alarm. In these, the virus of corruption is generated, and from this source diffused through the system.

A judicious writer, (with the lamp of History before him,) says: "It is very uncommon to see "the laws and constitution of a State openly "and boldly opposed: it is against silent and "gradual attacks that a nation ought to be par-"ticularly on its guard—sudden revolutions "strike the imaginations of men: they are de-"tailed in history: their secret springs are de-"veloped. But we overlook the changes that "insensibly happen by a long train of steps "that are but slightly marked. It would be "rendering nations an important service to "show from history how many States have thus "entirely changed their nature, and lost their "original constitution. This would awaken "the attention of mankind—impressed thence-"forward with this excellent maxim, (no less "essential in politics than in morals,) *princi-"piis obsta*, they would no longer shut their "eyes against innovations, which, though incon-"siderable in themselves, may serve as steps to

"mount to higher and more pernicious enter-
"prises."

The unlimited appropriations of money—the consequent and inevitable endowment of Executive prerogative, with its beguiling agency in dispensing the public treasures—the inconsistent power in the President of removing at pleasure the disbursing officers whose appointments require the concurring sanction of the Senate—the extrusion of this advising and checking body, in expelling from office—and the inseparable venality and dependence of the treasury guards upon a single man, are serious encroachments, that fill me with alarm. Sir, the representatives of the people were very wisely intended to exert an uncontrolled sovereignty over the money of the people.

The course of things does indeed retain with us the flattering and deceptive shadow of this power, while its efficient substance is gliding into other hands.

The warning voice of my colleague, and as he is not present, I will say my distinguished colleague, Mr. Randolph, brought to my recollection yesterday, that excellent clause in our Virginia bill of rights, which declares "That no "free government, or the blessing of liberty, can "be preserved to any people, but by a firm ad-"herence to justice, moderation, temperance, "frugality, and virtue, and by a frequent re-"currence to fundamental principles."

Speculation upon the practical conformity of the Government, to the axioms of political justice, is more important than may at first sight be imagined. It strikes at the root of mischievous profusion, and chills its noisome and pernicious influence. It tends to familiarize us to those strict and severe tests of trust and duty, without which our energy, as well as our usefulness, will be contracted to a very narrow compass.

The money power of Congress, (conspiring thro' the President's prerogative with the strong passions and the yielding weaknesses of human nature) is placed in dangerous resistance to the best and soundest principles of public safety. It is the Trojan horse within the walls of the Constitution. Its powerful and irresistible operation is first to enlarge the sphere of action for the whole government, but its resulting and inevitable tendency is to concentrate accumulated powers in the Executive head. Sir, there are three active creating and created agents in our confederation—the People, the States, and this creature of both, the Federal Government.—By moving upon antagonist principles, they will mutually preserve, by reciprocally checking the inordinate action of each other. Great occasions will sometimes arise, in which they may become so bound together in action, as, in producing temporary advantage, to engraft upon the system the germ of future destruction.

Our recurrence to original principles cannot be too frequent. With all the necessities for the last war, and amidst all the glories which hardy valor achieved for us, upon the ocean and in the field—one of its lingering evils casts its shadow within the view. The spirit of patriotism, operating upon the antagonist principles to which I have alluded, associated them in action, expanded the powers of this government, infused into it additional vigor, and endowed it anew by simple rules of construction. An additional class of implied powers is one of its fruits. The greatest difficulty will always be found in disrobing government of its investments, after the exigency of the hour has passed away. When did power ever make a voluntary relinquishment? Its march is in the orbit of encroachment—and onward. Its footsteps are not to be traced in retrogression, unless down the precipice of revolution.

The dangers connected with the unrestricted power of applying the public money was at one time eloquently denounced, by a prominent member of the present administration. In the first effort of the talent for debate of Mr Clay, that I ever witnessed upon this floor, in contending against its existence, he said: "What is "to prevent the application of it to the pur-"chase of the sovereignty of a State itself, if a "State were mean enough to sell its sovereign-"ty: to the purchase of kingdoms, empires, the "globe itself?" It is the transcendent instrument with which Cæsar and Bonaparte, both declared that universal dominion might be obtained. Yet we look with calmness and indifference upon the progressive enlargement and consolidation of this power in the executive. With the flowers of prerogative that already adorn this department, this great lever is only wanting to give it an absolute control.

It has become fashionable among a certain class of politicians, to deride our fears of encroachment, and to denominate the plain common sense rules of interpretation—Virginia principles. Let me tell gentlemen, that these principles, in their legitimate scope, will yet prevail. Their foundation is in the broad basis of human rights. While they persuade to social order, and a love of union, they inculcate resistance to lawless oppression. They have always been found upon the side of liberty, combatting against power—foremost in the field of contest for independence, that "lord of the lion heart and eagle eye." A momentary triumph may be won over them by deceptive allurements for the sordid and selfish passions of "low ambition," and excited interests. Other hopes, by intensity of incitement may prevail for the fleeting season of deception, but the victory is temporary, and carries in its bosom the seeds of certain disappointment. Amid the collisions of new parties and new interests that are daily developed, I have a confidence that Virginia has the sagacity to discern the path of her duty, and the firmness to tread it fearlessly. She has no boon to ask, no favor to supplicate. Seeking neither emolument nor office, hers may yet be the attitude of Arbitress in the coming contests. If she cannot arrest, she may check; and by judiciously throwing her weight into the scale of controversy, make it preponderate upon the side of liberty and the constitution.

I ask, Mr. SPEAKER, that my resolutions be referred to the Committee on the Whole upon the State of the Union.

(This motion finally prevailed.)

CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHALL.

We find in the last Richmond Whig the following letter:

MARCH 29, 1828.

SIR: I perceive in your paper of to-day a quotation from the Marylander, of certain ex-

pressions ascribed to me respecting the pending election for the Presidency of the United States, which I think it my duty to disavow. Holding the situation I do under the Government of the United States, I have thought it right to abstain from any public declaration, on the election; and were it otherwise, I should abstain from a conviction that my opinions would have no weight.

I admit having said in private, that, though I had not voted since the establishment of the general ticket system, and had believed that I never should vote during its continuance, I might probably depart from my resolution in this instance, from the strong sense I felt of the injustice of the charge of corruption against the President and Secretary of State: I never did use the other expressions ascribed to me.

I request you to say that you are authorized to declare that the Marylander has been misinformed.

Very respectfully, your ob't.

J. MARSHALL.

JOHN H. PLEASANTS, Esq.

Having in vain invoked to their aid the names of Messrs. Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Crawford, the Coalition have at length hit upon that of Chief Justice Marshall. It is not our wish to deprive them of it. We had long since taken it for granted, that Mr. Marshall was in favor of the re-election of Mr. Adams. Before his appointment as Chief Justice, he was the zealous and able advocate of the elder Adams. He was decided in his denunciation and opposition to Mr. Jefferson. And it is said that although, as Chief Justice of the United States, he administered the oath of office to Mr. Jefferson, so strong were his partisan feelings, that he turned his back upon that distinguished statesman upon that occasion. It is well known that under the reign of terror, the Chief Justice was the leader of the administration party in the House; and that he was to the elder Adams what Mr. Webster has been to the younger. None have been more violent in their opposition to the Marshall family and federal influence than Mr. Clay; and so sensible was John Quincy Adams that the Chief Justice was unpopular with the republican party, that, after having, as the first act of his *pretended* apostacy, charged the federalists of the east with a *treasonable* negotiation with the Governor of Canada, he sought to confirm himself in the confidence of Mr. Jefferson, of Mr. Giles, and his *new* associates of the republican party, by procuring the impeachment of Mr. Marshall, for favoring the alleged treason of Aaron Burr.*

For our own part we are gratified to find that Mr. Marshall has resolved to vote for Mr. Adams, and we confess our obligation to those partisans, who, by slandering Gen. Jackson, have drawn forth this letter—especially as it enables us to fix the reasons for his preference and characterises the party with whom he acts.

Mr. Marshall says, I admit having said in private "though I had not voted since the establishment of the general ticket system, and had believed that I never should vote during its continuance, I might probably depart from my resolution in this instance, from the strong sense I felt of the injustice of the charge of corruption against the President and Secretary of State."

We do not know at what time this declaration was made; we do not know whether Mr. Marshall has examined all the proofs of bargain. (We cannot suppose that he can believe the parties guilty of the bargain and innocent of corruption.) That is a question which it becomes every citizen to examine for himself, and the late developements, and those yet to make, will leave no peg to hang a doubt upon. We therefore come to the cause assigned by him for the relinquishment of the most invaluable right as a citizen.

We have been taught to venerate the character of the Chief Justice as a man, and to respect him as a Judge, and we must admit that we regret to find that age, experience and his intercourse with the republican party, have not removed those deep seated prejudices and strong antipathies, which, although germinated in the vigor of his youthful intellect, and nurtured by the passion of party violence, should have been regulated by age, if not exterminated by the exercise of his official duty as Chief Justice of the United States. Josiah Quincy exclaimed: "Those who fell with the first Adams have risen with the second;" and John Marshall declares that, although in the mortification which followed the defeat of the elder Adams, he had said that he would relinquish his highest right as a citizen, yet when called upon to support the son he will resume it.

Upon this point we wish to be well understood. It will be recollected that the elder Adams was elected President by a vote given by one of the Virginia Electors. To prevent a similar triumph of federal principles, the Republicans of Virginia united their strength.

---

* Mr. Randolph in his late speech upon Retrenchment, speaking of this subject said:

"Sir, who persecuted the name of Hamilton while living, and followed him beyond the grave? The father and the son. Who were the persecutors of Fisher Ames, whose very grave was haunted as if by vampyres? Both father and son. Who attempted to libel the present Chief Justice, and procure his impeachment—making the seat of John Smith, of Ohio, the peg to hang the impeachment on? The son, as one of the grand jury, and my colleague, Mr. GARNETT, were called upon by the Chairman of the committee of the Senate, in Smith's case, (Mr. Adams,) to testify in that case. Sir, do you remember a committee raised at the same time in this House, to inquire whether the failure of Burr's prosecution grew out of "the evidence, the law, or *the administration of the law?*" For my sins, I suppose, I was put upon that committee. THE PLAIN OBJECT WAS, THE IMPEACHMENT OF THE JUDGE WHO PRESIDED ON THE TRIAL. This was one of the early oblations (the first was the writ of habeas corpus) of the present incumbent on the altar of his new political church. Who accused his former federal associates in New England of a traiterous conspiracy with the British authorities in Canada, to dismember the Union? The present incumbent. Yet all is forgiven him—Hamilton, Ames, Marshall, themselves accused of treason—all is forgiven; and these men, with one exception now support him: and for what?"

Mr. Madison went into the Legislature of the State, and his celebrated resolutions, which rank next to the Declaration of Independence itself, and a change of the electoral law from the district to the general ticket system were adopted. In consequence, Mr. Jefferson was elected President, and Judge Marshall, then a zealous leader of the federal party, in the mortification of defeat, declared that so long as that system, by which his party lost its power, prevailed, he would not vote at an election.

Can any republican longer doubt, which is the republican candidate for the Presidency, when they see this same man coming forward *now*, in support of the re-election of John Quincy Adams? We think not. Who can believe that Mr. Marshall is impelled to the support of Mr. Adams, by the charge of corruption against the President and Secretary of State? Admit that he believes them to be innocent of the charge, can he pretend that there is not strong presumption of guilt? and if it be a slander, what comparison is there between the abuse which has been published against Mr. Adams, and that with which the administration press teems, against General Jackson?

Judge Marshall, having, as he says, withdrawn from political strife, we are induced to believe, has not examined the proofs of bargain which have been published. When John Quincy Adams was before the public as a candidate of the Republican party, he was indifferent to his election; but no sooner does he find, by his intercourse with Mr. Webster and the measures of Mr. Adams' Administration, that Mr. Adams is the federal candidate, than all his youthful sympathies for the old federal party are revived, and he leaves the retirement into which he had been driven by the success of the Republican party, and again enters the list as partisan of the *federal* candidate. The inducements which are to operate upon Mr. Marshall, are, if possible, more powerful than those which led him to support the elder Adams. It is certain that no ordinary inducement could lead him to forget the apostacy, or to forgive the high injury which Mr. Adams meditated against himself.

Those inducements are associated with the feelings of his youth, and the political aspirations of a numerous and talented offspring, who believe that they have been kept in the back ground, by the political association of the Chief Justice.

Hence, they have hailed the fulfilment of the declaration of Mr. Quincy, as the certain removal of the only barrier which, in their opinion, has impeded their elevation to office and distinction.

We say, that we rejoice that this letter has been drawn from Judge Marshall, it will explain to the republican party, that as those who fell with the first Adams, have risen with the second, they, as a party, must unite upon Andrew Jackson, as their candidate, or be forever fallen.

We lately noticed the manifesto of the coalition, issued through the Journal, which taken with the letters from Washington, that appear in the coalition papers, proves that our opinion formerly expressed, to wit: that Messrs. Adams and Clay have resolved to defeat *any* Tariff, is correct.

The reason of this is obvious: What is the great end and aim of Messrs. Adams, Clay and Webster?

Answer. To re-elect Mr. Adams.

Q. How do they expect to effect that object?

A. By inducing the people to believe that Mr. Adams is, and that Gen. Jackson is not, the friend of Domestic Manufactures.

Q. Since Mr. Adams has made no declaration in favor of domestic manufactures, by what right does he claim to be their special patron?

A. By virtue of a report made by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the professions of his partisans in Congress.

Q. If Mr. Adams desires to be considered the patron of domestic industry, why did he not recommend their protection in his Message to Congress?

A. For the same cause that he refused to be the democratic candidate for Governor of Massachusetts. His father in his letter to William Cunningham, said:

"*I may mention to you in confidence, that considerable pains have been taken to persuade your friend John Q. Adams to consent to be run by the republicans. But he is utterly averse to it*, and so am I, for many reasons, among which are, 1st, The office, though a precious stone, is but a carbuncle shining in the dark. 2d, It is a state of perfect slavery. The drudgery of it is extremely oppressive. 3d, The Compensation is not a living for a common gentleman. 4th. He must resign his professorship. 5th, He must renounce his practice at the Bar. 6th, He must stand in competition with Mr Lincoln, which would divide the republican interest and certainly prevent the election of either. 7th, IT WOULD PRODUCE AN ETERNAL SEPARATION BETWEEN HIM AND THE FEDERALISTS, at least that part of them who now constitute the absolute Oligarchy."

Now it is well known that Mr. Adams has been courting the mercantile as well as the manufacturing interest; if *he* had taken the same bold ground in favor of manufactures that was assumed by Mr. Rush, it would have caused an eternal separation between him and the mercantile interest, which he could not afford to lose, because it will require all the interest which he can bring into the field to carry New England.

Q. How then can Mr. Adams expect to deceive the people into a belief that he is the friend of domestic manufactores?

A. It is known that a majority of both Houses are favorable to the election of Gen. Jackson: it is also known that the representatives from the Southern States are unanimously opposed to a tariff, and the partisans of Mr. Adams say that Gen. Jackson's friends being opposed to a tariff, ergo—he is anti-tariff.

Q. But is not Mr. Adams indebted to anti-tariff votes for his election?

A. Yes. Messrs. Brent and Gurley gave the casting vote in his favor; they represent an anti-tariff State—and besides a large majority of those who voted for Mr. Adams from New England, particularly in Massachusetts, were opposed to the tariff of 1824.

Q. How has this change of policy thus been brought about?

A. It was part of Mr. Clay's plan to unite the east and the west against the south.

Q. But has not Mr. Clay's plan, been to unite the south and west against the east?

A. Yes. Until the west brought forward General Jackson, and the south Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Clay was desirous to be considered as the representative of southern and western interests. Hence as late as 1824, he proposed a duty of ten cents per gallon on molasses, and was ready to sacrifice the tariff of 1824, for half a cent per yard on cotton bagging.

Q. What has caused Mr. Clay to change his policy?

A. He sees that if Mr. Adams is not elected, the people will choose the successor of General Jackson, without regard to the *safe* precedent, which he is desirous to perpetuate; or in other words, he sees that if the people refuse to ratify his contract with Mr. Adams, Mr. A. will not have the power to appoint his successor, and that he must retire into disgrace, without the means to pay the Morrison legacy, which he has put into his own pocket, instead of paying it over to the Transylvania University.

Q. But how does it appear that Messrs. Adams and Clay are desirous to defeat the present tariff bill?

A. It fully appears in the speeches of their partizans, the letters written from Washington, to be published in their distant presses, and the manifesto issued from the National Journal.

Q. What benefit can the coalition expect from such a policy?

A. It is known as we have said, that a majority in both Houses are in favor of the election of General Jackson. Therefore no bill can pass, without it is supported by a portion of his friends, and it consequently follows, that the administration cannot claim the entire credit of the tariff. Whereas it is known that if all General Jackson's friends were to unite, they could carry any bill, and it will be easy to charge, that the defeat of the bill was caused by their opposition to it.

Q. And is not this correct?

A. No. It is well known that the Committee who reported the tariff bill, were friendly to Gen. Jackson's election, and it is also known, that although many of the Southern members are opposed to any tariff, yet, many of the members who are from the Western and middle States, who are in favor of the election of Gen. Jackson, are also in favor of the tariff, and if the administration party in the House, were to unite with these, it would be easy to pass the bill.

Q. Why then do they not so unite?

A. Aye, there's the rub. If they were to unite with the friends of Gen. Jackson, and carry the bill, the partisans of the administration would have no opportunity to use the tariff for electioneering purposes, during the next summer. This hobby of the coalition being put aside, the people would have full time to look into the bargain, intrigue and management, by which Mr. Adams was made President, and Mr. Clay put in the line of safe precedent.

Q. But how can the partisans of the coalition vote against the tariff?

A. They will vote against it in detail. As for instance. They will oppose a duty on iron, hemp, molasses, wool and foreign spirits?

Q. If the friends of Messrs. Adams, Clay and Webster, oppose an additional duty upon iron, hemp, molasses, wool and foreign spirits, how can they expect to deceive the people of the middle and western States, into a belief, that they are in favor of a tariff?

A. Mr. Clay undertakes to answer for the west. In the mean time, Mr. Webster apologises to his federal friends upon the ground, that a monopoly of manufacturing is necessary to keep the balance of political power in New England in their hands.

Q. Is it true then, that the bill now proposed by the Jackson Committee of Manufactures, does not afford a protection to the Manufacturers?

A. No, it is not true. It has been clearly demonstrated that the measure of protection is greater than that given by the celebrated woollen's bill, of last session. The great difference is, that the present bill protects the grain grower, the wool grower, the hemp grower, the distiller of domestic spirits and the Iron Manufacturer. The bill of last year looked to the manufacture of woollen goods alone.

Q. If the present bill affords protection to so many interests, why should not all parties unite to effect its passage?

A. This question is already answered. Because a portion of the southern members are opposed to any tariff, and the partizans of the Administration, who hold the "balance of power," are desirous to have the tariff as an electioneering hobby, during the next Summer. If they succeed, well—if they fail they lose nothing, because it will be nothing more than a defeat, which they expect at any rate.

Q. But will not a vote against this bill, by any tariff man, be a desperate act?

A. Yes, it will truly be a desperate act, but desperate cases require desperate remedies. If the bill is defeated and the people can be deceived, a few votes may, by possibility, be picked up. If this plan don't succeed, then will John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, and Daniel Webster sing, farewell, a long farewell to all their dreams of greatness.

But we recommend to our readers, the following from the Democratic Eagle:

PRESIDENT ADAMS.

Article II—Section I—Clause VIII. of the constitution of the United States, declares that the President shall *swear* or *affirm* that he will "faithfully execute the office of President of the United States."——

Article II—Section III—enjoins upon the President to "recommend to the consideration of Congress such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

Mr Adams in his last message does *not recommend* a revision of the TARIFF:—he does *not recommend* any measure for the encouragement of DOMESTIC MANUFACTURES: he does *not recommend* any measure for the encouragement of WOOL-GROWERS: he does *not recommend* the AMERICAN SYSTEM: he does *not* say one word on the subject of the Tariff—or, domestic manufactures—or, wool—or the AMERICAN SYSTEM.

THE CASE then stands thus:—Mr. Adams under

the obligation of an oath, to "recommend to the consideration of Congress such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient"—does *not* recommend the American system—a tariff—the encouragement of domestic manufactures, or the growth of wool.

On his oath, then, he does *not* consider the encouragement of domestic manufactures—wool—a tariff—or the American system "*necessary and expedient.*"

The Friends of General Jackson, far from charging Mr. Adams with the *heinous crime* of *violating his oath*, are perfectly willing that entire credit be given him, for the utmost *sincerity*; and only complain, that certain *designing* politicians, have *craftily* imposed upon a number of patriotic and honest citizens, and induced them to believe, that he is in favor of what, *on his oath*, he virtually disavows.

Doubt on this subject can no longer exist. Every man can now, *wide awake*, take his side.

General Jackson has repeatedly and publicly —*in Congress by his votes*—and out of Congress as a *citizen*, manifested his friendship for the American System; *Mr. Adams*—never:—but in the public discharge of an imperious and all important duty, Mr. Adams, in effect, proclaims to the whole nation that he does NOT consider the American system "necessary and expedient."

The Administration are actively striving to inculcate the belief, that, *they only* are favorable to the manufacturing interest, or to any system of laws whereby the national industry, whether employed in agriculture, commerce or manufactures, shall be protected against foreign competition. They are also endeavoring, with characteristic activity and disregard to means, to produce the impression that, General Jackson and his supporters are *all* opposed to any system of protection. Hence, say they, these supporters have reported a bill, which, they knew, would be rejected; whereby they could attain their secret object, and also retain the reputation of being favorable to the protecting system. All this is a miserable delusion, attempted to be circulated for political purposes. The Administration are not the exclusive friends, nor the opposition the exclusive opponents of the system. General Jackson is in favor of a tariff that shall promote the prosperity of the whole nation, and has so declared by his votes in Congress. Mr. Adams has never committed himself on the subject, and we defy any of his adherents to produce a single sentence from any public document offered by him, which contains a distinct and specific declaration in favor of the manufacturing interest.

We maintain that, the administration have endeavored to render the tariff question subservient to their re-election; and that they will endeavor to defeat the passage of *any bill* on the subject at the present session, in order to retain it for an electioneering topic during the ensuing recess. Upon this subject, the people of this Union may be classed in the following manner. The southern people are opposed to all tariffs for any other purpose than revenue, under the impression that, any duties beyond what are necessary to this object, would operate as a tax upon their necessaries and comforts, to the exclusive benefit of the northern manufacturers. The people of the middle and western states are in favor of a tariff that shall protect their agriculture and manufactures, and are therefore opposed to the *free trade* system of the south, and the exclusive policy of the manufacturers of the North. The people of the North are divided into three classes. One is mercantile, and opposed to all tariffs that shall interfere with their shipping monopoly; the other, owners of large manufacturing establishments, who wish a tariff that shall enable them to buy raw materials cheap, and sell manufactures dear; the other, the agriculturists, who are favorable to manufacturing, because it furnishes a home market for their produce, and to such protection to wool, their great staple, as shall save it from the present ruinous foreign competition. Upon the bill now before the House, the members of Congress may be classed in the following manner. Those from the South are decidedly opposed to it, as they are to all legislation on this subject. They do not engage in the debate on the details, because they intend to oppose the general principles, after the details shall have been settled. Some of them entertain doubts of the power of Congress to legislate on the subject; and all of them believe that it will sacrifice their agriculture to what they consider a northern monopoly. Upon the correctness of these opinions we are silent; our object being to state facts, and leave discussion upon this subject to the people and their representatives. Those from the Middle and West are in favor of it, because it protects their three great agricultural staples, grain, hemp, and wool; and also, because it affords, in their estimation, a sufficient protection to woollen manufactures, which they deem a great national interest, whose success is intimately connected with their agricultural prosperity. Those from the North represent various interests, and disagree accordingly. Those who represent mercantile districts are opposed to all duties on hemp and iron, because they deem such duties injurious to navigation, the market for these articles. They are also opposed to duties on wool, because some of their constituents are concerned in large manufacturing corporations who wish to obtain wool cheap, and others in shipping which is employed in importing wool. Those from the interior are willing to protect the wool growers who are a great interest in N. England, and the manufacturers of iron, who are numerous in N. Hampshire and Vermont; but are opposed to the reported duties on cloths, as being insufficient, and on molasses, as taxing an article of extensive consumption, both raw and distilled. They also consider that a duty on molasses would exclude them from the West Indies, the great market of their lumber, fish, live stock and agricultural produce, and ruin their distilleries, from which rum is extensively exported.

tariff, in Congress and among the people. Any person of ordinary sagacity must perceive that, amid this variety of interests, a skillful politician would find abundant materials for combinations to operate upon the important election now pending. This has not escaped the lynx eyed Machiavellian who rules the cabinet of *curiosities* now in this city. This great political Judas Iscariot, who can cut, shuffle, trump, revoke, brag, stand, throw up, misdeal, stock, and all with equal facility for any purpose, knows every card in this game of interests, and is working to loo them all and take the pool of the next election. His object is to prevent the passage of *any* bill, and to ascribe its defeat to the Jacksonians. He is sure of opposition from the South to all tariffs. He knows that the South and North united, with such stragglers as can be picked up from the West and Middle, are sufficient for his purpose, and therefore endeavors to combine them. Accordingly, such tools as John C. Wright must have their cue. They are instructed to oppose every thing on the subject, except the *woollens bill* of the last session, though that bill offered less protection to woollens than does the bill now before the House. They are instructed to oppose the reported duty on hemp, iron, and molasses, as *sine qua nons* with the New England States. Hence we may infer that, if that part of the bill relating to wool and woollens be amended according to the wishes of the manufacturers, most of the northern members, with all the Administration men from the Middle and West will still demur, on account of these *sine qua nons*. If the bill be thereby defeated, the *factionists* will ascribe its defeat to the opposition, by charging them with having designedly reported a bill which, they knew, the North would oppose. Indeed, this charge has already been made; and to show that it was part of the plan above stated, we would mention that, it was made long before the bill was reported, and consequently, before its provisions, could have been known. This premature accusation was unlucky, for it exposed the designs of the Administration.

Under such a state of facts, we would advise all who are desirous of promoting the prosperity of the country, to be awake, and fall into no traps baited by Mr. Clay. He no more regards the manufacturing interest of this country than that of China. All he says about the American System is miserable cant, intended to deceive the honest and purchase the venal. To prove this, at least to those who object against a certain provision in the bill reported, we would state that he is the very author of such provision. In 1824, Mr. Clay proposed, in Committee of the Whole, a duty of 10 cents per gallon on molasses, as an amendment to the tariff bill then before the House, and carried it by a vote of 90 to 88. Let the Northern people who raise, and the Northern members who confide in Mr. Clay, look to this. It is matter for reflection. And let all who seriously desire the prosperity of their country, legislate upon this subject without passion, prejudice, or regard to local interests. Above all, let them view it as perfectly unconnected with any election. A politician who would render it subservient to such purpose, is a political prostitute who would sell his country for an office.

MINISTER TO ENGLAND.

Under this head we find the following article in the Boston Patriot, credited to the Democratic Press:

"THE MINISTER TO ENGLAND.

"An extraordinary, unprecedented, and indefensible course of conduct has been adopted toward a distinguished citizen whose name has been, by his political enemies, brought before the public as that of the person whom the President had determined to nominate, as Minister to the Court of St. James. Without taking the trouble to ascertain whether this assertion was well founded, or without any foundation, the opposition papers have poured upon the individual named, a torrent of the foulest abuse. They have called upon the friends of General Jackson in the Senate, to oppose and reject his nomination, so soon as it should be made. Such was the eagerness and intemperance with which this subject has been pursued, that the Printer of the Senate, elected by that body to 'improve' the public press, has had the temerity, in his newspaper, to dictate to the Senate, the course which it was bound to take. On the other hand, grave essays have been written, with a most ambidextrous ambiguity, finding fault with all that had been said by, and holding forth the *name* of the individual, as one which would probably be sent by the President to the Senate for the honorable appointment, which it presumed, was about to be made.

"In the unsettled state in which the newly made up Ministry of Great Britain was left at our last advices from that country, it strikes us that no probable good would arise from the appointment at this time, of a Minister to the Court of London, and that therefore no Minister will now be appointed. By the late convention, the dispute about the North Eastern Boundary, is to be referred to an Arbitrator to be designated. Our Government has ratified this Convention. The English Government may or may not ratify it, but probably will. When mutually ratified, a Mediator is to be agreed on. Our Government, it is presumed, will nominate the Emperor of Russia, and it is hardly to be presumed, that England will object against him.

"Until these questions, therefore, are finally settled, it would be of no avail to send a Minister to England, inasmuch as he could not be furnished with full instructions. As it is not expected that we shall get the ratification of the Convention from England during this session of Congress, and as the President would not, without pressing reasons, make so important a nomination in the recess, our opinion is, that no Minister will be appointed until the next session.

"We have been induced to take this brief notice of the subject, to show, with how little cause, to how little purpose, and upon what slender grounds, public men, the most distinguished, are brought before the public to be baited and abused, to subserve the views of factious and partisan politicians."

The subserviency of John Binns to the Secretary of State, forbids the idea that such an article would appear in the Press, without it was fully authorized by him. Whether it is the result of a cabinet council, or the effort of Mr. Clay to postpone Mr. Webster's demands, ...

till after the cast of the Presidential election, is a question yet to be developed.

That Mr. Webster holds the bond of Mr. Adams, and that he, like Shylock, demands its performance, cannot now be doubted.

When the editor of the National Palladium stated the fact, and inadvertently varied some of the details from the truth of the case, Mr. Adams then on his way from Boston, authorized the Editor of the N. Y. American to contradict the charge. Mr. Webster, however, placed too high a value on the document. He would not permit its obligation to be cancelled on such terms. Had he like Mr. Adams denied that he held the pledge upon which the federal members of Congress voted for Mr. Adams, and the federal party have since supported his administration, such a denial would have operated as a release of its condition. But no! the precious instrument, obtained with so much address, was not so relinquished. Mr. Webster still demands the pound of flesh.

The article before us was written with an art which no vulgar writer could attain. It bears the stamp official on its face. It penetrates the *secret* policy of the Cabinet. In the present unsettled state of the ministry it is not supposed that any good would arise from the appointment, at this time, of a minister to the Court of London!!

Now, it cannot escape the notice of every reader, that the very reason here given why we should not be represented at the "court of London," is the very reason why we should be represented there, by a minister well acquainted with the important points in controversy, who, being on the spot, could avail himself of the earliest opportunity to urge the adjustment of the serious difficulties which unhappily threaten to prejudice the existing relations between the two governments. When could there be a more favorable moment for us to press the settlement of our difficulties, than that which threatens to envelope the whole Continent in war, and when the new ministry must be desirous to strengthen themselves with the people, as a measure preparatoy to it?

It is manifest that the reason here given, why Mr. Webster will not be nominated, is any other than the true one.

Rumor says that Mr. Clay himself desires this mission as a retreat. It may be that the nomination is postponed until after the Presidential election, that he may then determine whether it will be better for him to remain in the line of safe precedent, or throw himself on the magnanimity of Gen Jackson. That he will venture upon the latter may be doubted by some, but by none who know him as we do. He may hope that Gen. Jackson will not recall him; if so, his forbearance will be used as an argument against the charge of bargain; if he should be recalled, he will have pocketed, for a few months services, about twenty thousand dollars, a sum sufficient to pay the Morrison Legacy to the Transylvania University, and will charge the next President with vindictive persecution.

For ourselves, we believe that the true secret of the article is to be found in the fact, that the late election in New Hampshire exhibits an effort on the part of the democratic republicans, which has alarmed both Mr. Adams and Mr Clay. It is known that the democracy of New England form the majority of electors, and it is feared that the nomination of Mr. Webster, will be the signal for an union of the republican party, that will leave Mr. Adams in a minority in New England.

Hence, while on the one hand, Mr. Webster will not consent to the nomination of any other person, and Mr. Clay will not consent to endanger the vote of New England by the nomination of Mr. Webster, the great interests of this nation, like the colonial trade must be postponed, sacrificed, that Daniel Webster may be rewarded for the part which he acted in the election of Mr. Adams.

As to the notice which is taken of this press, and the manner in which we have expressed our opinions upon this subject, we have only to remark, that our opinions and our press are our own, which our relation to the public requires us to keep above any influence arising from our appointment as Printer to the Senate. The appointment is not, and never will be held as the price of our independence. We shall certainly regret to find our opinions in conflict with a body, for whom we entertain so much respect, and whose good opinion we so highly value; but if a difference of opinion should arise, it will be found that whilst we place a proper estimate upon the opinion of others we have firmness to express our own.

We invite the attention of the "Professor of Signs," to the following LETTER of the Hon. Mr. C[illegible].

WASHINGTON CITY, 7 April, 1828.

Messrs. GREEN & JARVIS:—The "Banner and Whig," published in Nashville, contains an article upon the subject of the Presidential election, which I am sure must have been designed to misguide and influence public sentiment abroad. It is said that "a number of the citizens of the western district of Tennessee, have determined upon running a candidate for the office of elector, favorable to the re-election of Mr. Adams."

I consider it a duty which I owe to truth, and the people, to say, that it is a mere *trick!!!!* A "*number*," may have determined upon the course suggested. Residing, however, as I do, in that district, and having the honor to represent it, I do not hesitate to say that, the "number" is very small indeed. So small that nothing short of the vanity of the FROG, which aspired to be an OX, could kindle the slightest hope of success, in such a project.

The western district is too firm to be shaken by so delusive a breeze. Those who inhabit it, know how to appreciate the benefits of liberty; and while they enjoy it, they will fix a proper estimate upon those who have fought to defend it. Among that number *Gen. Jackson* stands pre-eminent.

I have made these remarks, with a view to remove any impression which might be made by the statement alluded to. It is at best a *misrepresentation* of facts.

I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*,

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, APRIL 26, 1828. No. 7.

GEN. JACKSON'S LITERATURE.

The tacticians of the coalition are at a great loss to know how to tack ship so as to elude the public vigilance, and the exposure of the bargain and intrigue by which Mr Adams came into office—an i the corrupt means by which he attempts to retain it. Binns cries out stick to the six militiamen. That, says the manufacturer of the Harris letter, is the only plank left upon which to ride the waves, of public indignation. Whereas, Messrs. Adams, Clay, and Barbour, prefer to stick to the tale get up here about Gen. Jackson's literature.

The Journal of yesterday gives us a long article, in the best style of Mr. Clay, on the subject of the note to the Editors of the Washington Journal—which that veracious print attempts to palm off upon the public as a genuine note from Gen. Jackson. That our readers may judge of the precious morceau, we give it as published in the Journal:

"*To the editors of the Washington Journal.*

"When the midnight assassins plunges his dagger in the heart and rifles your goods, the turpitude of this scene looses all its horrors, when compared with the secrete assassins poinard levelled against femal character by the hired minions of power."

The Journal calls lustily for comparison of hand writing—to this we reply that Judge White and Mr. Polk, have both examined the pretended note, and find it to be written, on the blank leaf of a pamphlet, in imitation of General Jackson's hand writing; and they both concur in saying that they do not believe that it was written by him. And we do not hesitate to declare, that it wants nothing but the name of Gen. Jackson, to make it as base a forgery, as that published by John Binns.

The Journal of yesterday, fully explains the reason why this attempt at forgery was gotten up. That organ of the Executive Cabinet, published, on Monday, what it declares to be a literal copy of Gen. Jackson's letter to Mr. Campbell, a member of Congress, dated 15th of October, 1812; and refers to the note to prove, that that letter is correctly published; and to the letter to prove, that the note is genuine!! Most conclusive logic!! One would have thought, that Peter and his employers had been long enough at their trade to know, that two lies never yet made one truth.

On the other hand, two lies very often expose each other. Thus, for instance: Peter on one day publishes a *note* to prove, that Gen. Jackson cannot spell female, and now he publishes a letter in which the word is introduced, and spelled literally correct. Liars should have good memories!! Consistency is important in more points than one. It is said of a certain judge, in one of the western territories, that when he was about to pronounce an opinion of the Court, being reminded by a member of the bar, that the opinion which the Court was about to give, was directly in opposition to an opinion delivered on a former occasion, he said: "*That is a matter we must examine into, for it is better that the Court should be* CONSISTENTLY *wrong, than* INCONSISTENTLY *right.*"

The Journal and its wire workers have tried almost every artifice to destroy General Jackson, except *murder*, and knowing them as we do, we expect them to attempt his *burial* before next October. We advise our friends to be on the alert, and to bear in mind that, about the first of October, they may expect to see the National Intelligencer, the Journal, and even Binns in mourning, for the *pretended* death of Gen. Jackson.

That our readers may know the extremity to which the coalition is driven, we insert an extract from the letter of General Jackson, as furnished by the Secretary of War, and published in the Journal, premising it, by saying that, like many other writers, General Jackson makes the e, the a and the o so much alike, that they may be often mistaken for each other, especially by one who desires so to mistake them. But to the extract. It is as follows:

"When I recd your letter of the 10th of April last inclosing me an extract of the Secretary of Wars letter to Silas Dinsmore agent to the Chactaw nation, I, nor the citizens of West Tennessee, hesitated not, to believe that Silas Dinsmore would cease to exercise over our citizens such lawless tyranny as he had been in the habit of, and that our peacefull and honest citizens would be left to enjoy the free and unmolested use of that road as Secured to them by treaty—you can easily Judge and so can the [Secre]tary of War, our surprise and indignation, at the wanton in]sult offerred to the whole citizens of West Tennessee by the the publication of his card in the Clarion—in which he boasts—that he has set at defiance the Solem treaty that secures to our citizens and those of the United States the free and unmolested use of that road as well as the express instructions of the Secretary of War of the 23d of March last, and boast his detention of a defenceless woman and her property—*and for what!* the want of a passport—*and my god;* is it come to this—are we *free men or are we Slaves is this real or is it a dream*—for what are we involved in a War with great Britain—is it not for the Support of our rights as an independant people and a nation, Secured to us by nature and by natures god as well as Solem treaties and the law of nations—and can the Secretary of war for one moment retain the idea, that we will permit this petty Tyrant to Sport with our rights Secured to us by treaty and which by the law of nature we do possess—and Sport with our feelings by publishing his *lawless tyranny exercised over a helpless* and *unprotected female*—if he does he thinks too meanly of our Patriotism and galantry—were we base enough to Surrender our independant rights Secured to us by the bravery and blood of our

fore fathers, we are unworthy the name of *freemen*—and we view all rights Secured to us by Solemn treaty, under the Constituted authority, *rights* Secured to us by the blood of our fathers and which we will never yield but with our lives."

This letter was dated at Nashville, in October, 1812, not long after the families of Manley and Crawley had been murdered at the mouth of Duck River, and refers to the fact, that fifteen of the murderers had passed near Kaskaskia to join the Prophet.

One of the Editors was a resident of Kentucky at this time, and well recollects the strong excitement felt by all classes at the improper conduct of the agent. Surrounded as he was, by Indians, subject to his influence, and whose character at that time was equivocal, his acts of petty tyranny in shutting up the only highway between the Western States and New Orleans, for at that time there were no steamboats in the Mississippi, was seriously felt by every citizen; and Gen. Jackson refers more to the feeling which pervaded the whole community, than himself, when he said:

"Should we be deceived in this, (the assurance that Dinsmore would be removed,) be *frank* with the Secretary of war, that we are free men, and that we will Support the Supremacy of the laws, and that the wrath and indignation of our citizens will sweep from the earth the invader of their legal rights and involve Silas Dinsmore in the flames of his agency house."

The letter of Gen. Jackson was, as we have said, a private letter written to his friend, then a member of Congress, enclosing the following certificates to be laid before the Secretary of War:

"I do certify, that some time in the month of August last, on my way from Natitoches, I passed the Agency house in the Choctaw Nation, with two servants, and enquired for Silas Dinsmore, the agent, who was not then at home. I tarried for the space of an hour or more, and no person demanded a passport of me. I then proceeded on my journey, met Mr. Dinsmore, near the pigeon roost, who asked me for my passport. I informed him that I had none. He appeared astonished that I should have come through without one. I told him I had been advised, that it was not necessary, as he had been advised by the Secretary of War, to desist from stopping of property, under the pretext he had heretofore done, and that I had it in my power, without any inconvenience, to have procured a passport, had it been deemed necessary. He admitted, he had received such instructions, with discretionary power to detain property, under suspicious circumstances, but that he would not undertake to discriminate, and should under circumstances act as he had done, until the powers under which he acted, were entirely taken from him. He then took an obligation of me, to give him, from some proper person, a certificate of the right of property, and gave me a passport to proceed.

Certified at Nashville, this 26th of September, 1812. JOHN GORDON.

NASHVILLE, Oct. 8, 1812.

"I certify, that I believe that the note I published in the Clarion, as a card from Silas Dinsmore, Esq. United States' Agent to the Choctaw Nation, was wrote by him. I have seen his hand-writing often, and I am very confident that the note is in the same hand-writing.

Having been long vexed with the arrogant assumptions of Mr. Dinsmore, of powers that he did not, I believe, legally possess, I have often expressed, in the public papers, the indignation that his conduct excited in my mind. The continued detentions of the servants of gentlemen of this State, travelling to and from Natchez, compelled the investigation of the authority, Mr. Dinsmore, as Choctaw Agent, had to detain any person travelling the highway, between the Western States and Natchez; the result of which was an order from the War Department (a copy transmitted to me by G. W. Campbell, Esq.) published by me last spring. For a while, the positive instructions of the War Department were not deviated from, that I have ever heard, and travellers discontinued applying for passports. The summer passed away, and as the fall approached, the old practices were revived. A gentleman of Nashville had his servant taken from him, because he had no passport, in the most aggravating manner. Incensed at this wanton dereliction of duty, I lost not a moment in holding him up in the public papers, to the just indignation of the people. To silence the clamors of the people, by showing that he would do as he pleased, I conjecture was the motive for his writing the note above alluded to. But, be the motive what it may, I feel confident that he not only wrote the note, but that he has taken the servants of Mrs. Sibley from her, whether, as has heretofore been said, to gather in his crop, or not, I pretend not to offer a conjecture.

I understand Mr. Dinsmore justifies his conduct; but of that I have nothing to say. General James Robertson has just stept into my office, and says he was informed by Mr. Dinsmore, that he did write the letter to me, and that he would continue to act as he had done.

Yours, with respect,

T. G. BRADFORD.

Gen. JACKSON.

Card of Mr. Dinsmore to the Democratic Clarion.

Mr. Dinsmore, United States' Agent to the Choctaws, presents his compliments to the Democratic Clarion, and informs him that, yesterday, he arrested ten negroes and people of color, in possession of Mrs. Sibley, the particulars this time, viz: they had no passport.

September 11, 1812.

It is only necessary to say, that the agent had been instructed by the Secretary of War, to permit persons, not of suspicious character, to pass without a passport. That the citizens of Kentucky and Tennessee, understanding that passports would not be required, were induced to come on to the agency, and were then under the necessity of going back through the wilderness, or submit to such exactions as the petty tyrant thought proper to impose. This card, in defiance of public opinion, and directly, as was believed in violation of his instructions, was calculated to produce great excitement, which the fact stated in the certificate of Mr. Bradford, that the property of a *helpless and unprotected female* had been taken from her was calcu-

lated to increase. Surrounded, as Dinsmore was by a body of Indians, his mandates were easily enforced, and there are few who have been on a frontier settlement, who cannot appreciate the feeling, which, under such circumstances, prompted General Jackson's letter.

He saw a storm gathering over the agent. He had seen that agent, in violation of his instructions, "*exercise his lawless tyranny over a helpless and unprotected female.*" He saw that, unless the agent was removed, the people would be excited to burn down the agency house Did he endeavor to excite the populace? No. He wrote to his representative in Congress—enclosed the evidence of the agent's misconduct, and urged him to apprize the Secretary of the state of public feeling. Dinsmore was removed. Had Gen. Jackson stimulated the excited populace, Dinsmore, instead of being now in the service of the coalition, would, in all probability, have expiated his oppressions by his life.

What argument was so well calculated to keep down the voluntary action of the people, as an assurance that their grievances had been properly represented by Gen. Jackson to their representative, whose duty it was to make them known to the Secretary of War.

As well might a riot be charged to the individual who points out to the incensed populace the proper and legal redress of a grievance, as to charge the excitement produced by the conduct of Dinsmore to Gen. Jackson.

But to the letter. It will be seen that it was a private letter, written to a confidential friend—and, as evidently appears from its face, a letter written in the haste and carelessness of private confidence. It is true that General Jackson did not stop to dot every i, or to cross every t. It appears that where the word began with s, that letter was so written, that the Honorable Secretary, under whose sanction, we are told, a *literal* copy was made out, has pronounced it to be a capital, instead of a small s. Whether the honorable retailer of Binns' forgeries, held a council of war, or took the advice of his *clerks* on this occasion, we are not informed; but the Earl must have been driven to the last ditch, when he consented to resort to such an expedient.

We ask every reader to take up the letters of the first men in the nation, and examine them carefully, and see how few there are that cross the t and dot the i. We well recollect that the celebrated Mr. Nicholas, one of the first lawyers of his day, could scarcely read his own writing. Not because he could not read good writing—not because he was not a grammarian—but because his hand writing was so much like hieroglyphics, as to require an intimate acquaintance with it, and to those who knew it well, a view of the whole sentence to decipher his meaning.

Writing is mechanical, and always acquired before a knowledge of grammar or punctuation. Hence, many good grammarians do not punctuate. We have seen many of Gen. Jackson's letters, and venture to affirm that few, among our most literary men, are so accurate in their punctuation, as he is, in his usual correspondence.

We repeat that the coalition are driven to desperate shifts, when John Binns affirms that, the only hope of defeating the election of Gen. Jackson, depends upon his forgery of Harris', letter, and the official organ here attempts to prove that Gen. Jackson does not make all his letters of the same size, and that he does not dot an i or cross a t. ☞Drowning men will catch at straws!!.

Accident, however, has thrown in our way a complete answer to all this. Few men have aspired to a literary fame with more avidity than Mr. Wirt, the present Attorney General and Law officer of the Court. Mr. Wirt as well as Mr. Adams and Mr. Southard, has been a school master. It was his particular business to study syntax. We have before us, a criticism of his life of Patrick Henry, published in the American Monthly Magazine and Critical Review, for April, 1818. Tender mercy to the feelings of that gentleman, heretofore prevented a criticism on his *Eulogy* of Messrs Jefferson and Adams, the profits of which were so *generously* given to the daughter of Mr. Jefferson. But having brought out the whole of his forces in behalf of the existing administration, and resting its claim to public favor upon its superior literary merits, we have resolved to republish the criticism which some unknown writer has prepared for us. It is as follows:

"It now remains for us to take notice of the style of Mr. Wirt; far the greater part of which is such as is suited to the subject, the perspicuous and correct style of narration; though for great refinement or great elegance we look without being gratified. His attempts to dazzle have generally the effect of confusing. The *limæ labor et mora* are frequently discoverable; the *ars celare artem* seldom. He appears by no means a veteran with the pen; and often mistakes the toy-shop for the mint. To prove the correctness of our suggestions, it will be necessary to make many extracts from the work.—This will not be done with a disposition to cavil; but to exhibit blemishes, many of them the effects of carelessness, the exposure of which may have a beneficial effect on young writers, by inducing them to exercise more care in composition; the constant habit of which will ere long enable them to write with equal facility and purity.

Of the want of a table of contents we have already complained. This omitted, on the margin of every page ought to have been given the year of our Lord or the year of the man's life.

We do not recollect ever to have read a work so erroneous in punctuation as this life. Some have asserted that no rules can be given in this respect; and that every writer may make his pauses as best suits his own ear. Punctuation, however, is of great importance; and almost as reducible to rules as grammar or rhetoric. Let us take a few examples of Mr. Wirt's bad punctuation, of which almost every page affords many instances.

"It was produced by an incident of feeling, which however it affected the author at the time, might now, be thought light and trival by the reader; and he shall not therefore, be detained by the recital of it."—"He had never seen him, and was of course compelled to rely wholly on the information of others."—Page 1st of the Preface.

Here the comma after *which* is omitted; and improperly inserted after *now*. If inserted after

therefore, it ought also to precede it. If inserted after *of course*, it ought to precede those words.

"One of these will probably, be pronounced the most interesting passage of the work. He owes to the same gentleman too, the fullest, &c. From Judge Roane, the author has received, &c. The *vigour* and *elegance* with which that gentleman writes, *has*, &c Mr Jefferson too, has exercised, &c. and were sometimes, all contradicted, &c. The first, respects the Indians—Relying as they did, upon human memory merely, &c.—Other causes too, have contributed ——"

The improper punctuation in the above is readily seen. Where grammar and the ear so clearly show the path, it is surprising a man can so deviate. Let it not be considered hypercritical to notice these errors. Let us not be told,

> Commas and points he sets exactly right;
> And 'twere a sin to rob him of his mite.

Gross deficiencies in this respect are always indicative of deficiencies in the higher qualities of a good style.

Of an erroneous collocation of the parts of a sentence, of the dismemberment of what should be united, and of the injudicious combination, of what ought to be separate sentences, into one; the instances are numerous. They will readily occur to the critical reader: our limits will not allow the introduction of examples.

We shall now notice a few instances of tautology, bad grammar, the improper use of words, colloquial barbarisms and provincialisms, inelegancies and impurities.

"*Light* and *trivial*."—Page 5, Pref.

"The author had hoped to have had."—7. Read—had hoped to have; or, hoped to have had.

"Col. Meredith had been *raised*."—8. This word may be applied to grain or cattle; no English writer applies it to the education of children.

"The widow had intermarried with Judge Winston."—8. The widow had married Judge Winston.

"Had been raised in the same neighborhood, and *finally married*."—8—Here there is no *intermarrying with*.

"Vigor and elegance *has* frequently."—9.

"*Pretty* extended sketch."—10.

"From the year 1765 *down* to the close."—10.

"Not only to the dates, but to the facts *themselves*."—10.

"Strange mistakes in *facts*."—11—There may be mistakes in a *statement* of facts; but how could Mr. W. correct a mistake in a fact?

"The courts which he attends keep him *perpetually* and exclusively occupied—through *ten months* of the year."—12.

"The necessity *he was under*."—12—This separation of the preposition from the noun is avoided by all writers aspiring to elegance. In common conversation it is less objectionable, though here it ought to be avoided. In low comedy it is justifiable.

"For some reason *or other*."—14.

"In point of *personal* character were among the most respectable."—Page 1st of the work. Of what use here is *personal*?

"And lived long a life of integrity."—Perhaps a misprint for—lived a long life.

"In *the* mathematics."—4—Why here use *the*? Is it not equally proper to say—in the ethics, in the statistics?

"*Daring* and intrepidity."—6.

"Such as very rarely appear—on *this earth*."—7.

"No remarkable beauty *or* [nor] strength of expression."—7.

"Marked his *future* [subsequent] character."—7.

"Habits, *whose* spell."—Excepting in poetry, or personification, *whose* should never be applied to the neuter gender. Some of the best writers, however, violate this rule of grammar.

"Perhaps he flattered himself that he *would* be able to profit, &c."—12.—It is impossible to afford rules, at all times applicable, for the right use of *shall* and *will*, and of *would* and *could*. The correct English scholar is never at a loss which to employ; and his ear immediately takes ombrage when either of these words is improperly used. In Maryland and farther south, in many cases they are by the vulgar used indiscriminately.—"I *will* be twenty years old to-morrow."—"I thought I *would* have testimony enough." This common error in the southern States is the use of *will* and *would*, for *shall* and *should*.

"Ruin was behind him; poverty, debt, want and famine, before."—p. 14.—Had he escaped from ruin, or was ruin pursuing him? Was he driving poverty, and famine before him, or was he in pursuit of them?

"As if his cup of misery were not already full enough."—p. 14.—Omit *enough*.

"Thus supported, he was able to *bear up under* the heaviest pressure."—p. 14.—*Bear* only.

"Nature and grounds of the dispute."—p. 19.

"This war of words was *kept up*."—p. 21.—Continued. Kept up, bear up under, &c. such verbs used with what are called prepositions, are avoided, in almost all cases possible, by writers aiming at a dignity of style beyond the vulgar.

"Utterly null and void."—p. 22. This may be the language of the law.—If null, it *must* be *utterly* so; and of course void.

"The clergy had much the *best* of the argument."—p 22.—The *better*.

"Thus far the clergy *sailed before the wind*."—p. 22.

"*Bold* and *commanding*"—p. 25.

"For he *painted* to the *heart* with a *force* that [illegible] it"—p. 26.

"All their *senses listening* and *rivetted* upon the speaker, as if to catch the last strain of some heavenly visitant."—p. 26. How the sense of *smelling* could *listen*, or that of *sight* be *rivetted* to catch a *strain*, it is difficult to understand.

"Neither with a feeble *or* [nor] hesitating hand."—p. 28.

"His *mind* was disposed to *speak forth* his sentiments."—p. 29.

"Nor any *very* insuperable horror."—p. 29. He is so *very invincible* that nothing but a *very mortal* wound can kill him.

Beginning a sentence, as in page 29, with the words, *not that*, is highly erroneous.

"The character of his argument, proves indeed, [such the punctuation, as frequently:]

that he was a *bold* and *intrepid* enquirer."—p. 29.

"Equally inconsistent *both* with."—p. 30.

"*Expressly* for the *very* purpose."—p. 34.

"The *most entire* and *perfect* equality.—p. 35. *Perfect* and *entire* here means the same—neither can be compared.

"Nor did the people, *on their part*, desert him."—p. 36.

"A suit which had suffered very considerably *in the service*."—p. 39.

"Deep and *perfect* silence."—p. 40.

"To the levying [of] a revenue."—p. 41.

"The presses—seem rather disposed *to have looked* out for topics."—p. 42. Disposed to look or search, for topics.

"His mind *itself*, was of a very fine order."—p. 47.

"*Continued* and *unremitting*." p. 47.

"Never vehement, rapid *or* abrupt."—p. 47.

"*Manners* and *address*."—p. 47. The latter is certainly included in the former.

"He [George Wythe] was *perfectly* familiar with the authors of Greece and Rome."—p. 47. A much longer life than ever that of Mr. Wythe would be necessary for acquiring a *perfect* familiarity with all of them. Mr. Wythe was well acquainted with many of them

"*Openly*, *avowedly*, and *above board*."—p. 48.

"No man was ever *more entirely* destitute of art."—p. 48.

"The *port* and *carriage* of his head."

"His genius had that native *affinity*, which *combined* them [the beauties of an author] without an effort."—p. 49.

"*Vicious* and *depraved* pronunciation."—p. 54.

"*Work out* its purposes,"—p. 54.—Accomplish, gain, effect—any thing, but work out.

"*Bold* and *daring*."—p. 60.

"A *cool* and *clear accuracy* of *thinking*, and, an *elaborate exactness* and nicety in the *deduction* of *thought*."—p. 72. Cool, clear, accurate, elaborate, exact and nice *thinking* and *deduction* of *thought*.

"Towards whom every American *heart* will *bow*."—p. 105.

"In which he merely echoed *back* the consciousness of every other heart."—p. 106.

"*Swell* and *expand*."—p. 106.

"Called *down* from the height."—p. 108.

"His *performance* will not be the worse for having been taught to fly."—p. 111. Performance taught to fly.

"The *spirit* and *flame* of his genius."—p. 111.

"Resisted them with all their *influence* and abilities."—p. 117. One of the above italicised words is sufficient.

"Purchaser *thereof*."—p. 128. *Thereof*, for *of it*; *whereof*, for of which; *whereupon*, for *on which*; *hereupon*, for *on this*; are words that may still be proper in the long science of the bar; but have long since been excluded from elegant composition.

"The *transactions* which were passing in the metropolis, *circulated* through the country."—p. 135.

"That habitual *deference* and *subjection*, should be *dissolved* and *dissipated*."—p. 137.

"To *make of* this circumstance all the *advantage*."—p. 137. *Take* all the advantage

"Col. S. Meredith, who had theretofore commanded."—p. 140.

"He left *behind him* a message."—p. 151. Surely he could not leave it *before* him, unless he went backwards.

"Subvert the regal government *wholly* and *entirely*."—p. 160

"As is *proven*."—p. 164. At the appearance of this horrible word, used by Scotch lawyers, and by a few in the middle States, but by no English writer, and by no correct English scholar; we cannot forbear the expression of our astonishment. To *tote*, for to *carry*, would not be so barbarous. Mr. W. uses the word several times; and sometimes the English word *proved*. Why he should have *loven* this word or what has *moven* him to its adoption, we know not.

"He possessed *pretty nearly* as much experience as Washington."—p. 177. The truth is that he possessed pretty nearly, about not half a quarter so much. Of what use is *pretty* here? Mr. W. frequently has the word.

Pretty muddy walking to-day. She is a *pretty ugly* woman—are expressions *pretty nearly* as justifiable and elegant.

In page 226 the wrong tense is several times used. "His wife *had* died;"—"his uncle *had* died," &c. instead of his wife *died*, &c.

"*Seemed to have* been *pretty nearly paralized*."—p. 231.

"All its faculties *weak*, *disordered* and *exhausted*."—p. 232. *Exhausted* is sufficient.

"Humanity and civilization gradually *superinduced upon* the Indian character."—p. 240.

"*Equally the same* benefit."—p. 243.

"Some form of worship, or other."—p. 244.

"Such *an* one."—p. 263.

"The Roman energy and the attic wit of George Mason *was* there."—p. 263.

"Parts of *one entire whole*."—p. 270.

"*Uncoupled* and *let loose* to range the whole field."—p. 270.

"Day after day, from morning till night the galleries were *continually* filled."—p. 293.

"*Wanton profusion* and *prodigality* of that attic feast."—p. 294.

"Every mode—every species—*was* seen."—p. 294.

"*Ingenuous* and *candid*."—p. 314.

"It were *an* useless *waste*."—p. 242.

"His temper *unclouded* and *serene*."—p. 378.

"*Ingenuous* and *unaffected*."—p. 378.

"*Patient* and *tender forbearance* and kind *indulgence*."—p. 380.

"A *simple*, *pure*, economical and *chaste* administration."—p. 382.

"They contended that they were *simply* the *friends* of good order and government."—p. 382. That *they only* were, &c.

"A form so *faint* and shadowy."—p. 383.

"The rival *parties* observed every advance made by *the other*."—p. 389. By each other.

"So many stratagems to gain him over."—p. 389.

"Offensive measures which *was* intended."—p. 392.

"That *those scenes* were about to be acted *over* again in his own country."—p. 392.

That similar scenes were about to be acted in his own country. A man may eat two similar dumplings, but not one twice.

"A preacher, asked the people aloud, 'why they thus followed Mr. Henry about'"—p. 393

Asked the people why they followed, &c.—or, asked the people, "why do you thus follow Mr. Henry?"

"He never *possessed* that patient *drudgery*."—p. 405.

"Mr. Henry *on his part*, was so delighted." p. 410.

"*But for* the bold spirit of Mr. Henry, the people would, &c."—p. 419.

"So *far* from it *that* he stemmed the current." p. 419.

"The beaten *paths* and *roads* of thought."—p. 422.

While perusing the volume we noted some of the errors, in which the work is far from being deficient, and some of these we have here extracted. To notice all the similar inaccuracies, would swell this review to a pamphlet.

We shall now notice some of Mr. Wirt's rhetorical and frequently romantic strains—or rather strainings. His labour to shine often occurs; but in handling his rhetorical tools he is sometimes as awkward as would be a blacksmith in making a watch.

By turning to our extract relating to the Parson's cause, the reader may observe the sentence beginning with—"For now were those wonderful faculties, &c. The *fire* of his eloquence worked in him a *mysterious* and almost *supernatural* transformation of himself; and, as his *mind rolled* along, and began to *glow* from its own action, all the exuviæ [exuviæ] of the clown seemed to *shed themselves*," &c. The mind by *rolling*, *glowed*. Exuviæ means what is already shed.

Referring to the popularity of Mr. Henry among the *plebeian* part of the House of Burgesses, Mr. Wirt says. "They regarded him as a sturdy and wide-spreading oak, *beneath* [in] *whose* cool and refreshing shade they might take refuge from those beams of aristocracy, that had *played* upon them so long, with rather an unpleasant heat."

Instances of such hunting, for such inappropriate figures abound.

Mr. Henry was not apt to notice a provocation, unless gross, "but when he did notice it, better were it for the man [*who offered it*, understood] *never* to *have been born*, than to fall into the hands of such an adversary. One lash of his scourge was *infamy* for life; his look of anger or contempt, was almost *death*."

In page 85, Mr. W. compares the subsiding of contention after the repeal of the stamp act, to a volcano. This simile is not in strained terms, and is appropriate. We wish we could say so of all. "The rumbling of the volcano was still audible, and the smoke of the creator continually ascended, mingled not unfrequently with those flames and masses of ignited matter, which announced a new and more terrible explosion."

From the description of Henry's first speech in Congress, one might suppose that a god, or at least a demi god, was addressing that illustrious body. "Rising as he advanced with the grandeur of his subject, and glowing at length with all the majesty and expectation of the occasion, his speech seemed *more than that of mortal* man."—"Even those who had heard him, *in all his glory*, in the house of burgesses of Virginia, were astonished."—"His imagination coruscating with a magnificence and a variety, which struck even that assembly with *amazement and awe*."

We cannot forbear a smile in observing Mr. Wirt's determination to prove the heroism of Henry. With "*five thousand men* at least in arms," he marched against lord Dunmore, his aids-de-camp, and perhaps fifty others, to retake a quantity of powder, or obtain indemnification. Some of the patriots wished him to desist.—"It was in vain. He was inflexibly resolved to effect the purpose of his expedition, or *perish in the attempt*."

If Lord Dunmore issues a proclamation, "the Governor thunders his anathema." If Mr. Henry obtains great influence, "he *rushes like a comet* to the head of affairs." If Tarleton approaches the temporary seat of government, he "*rushes like a thunderbolt* into the village." If Mr. Henry expresses indignation toward an adversary, at the bar, it is "like *a stroke of lightning*," and his opponent "shrinks from his *withering look, pale and breathless*." In such extravagance of expression Mr. Wirt appears to take great delight. Is he not aware that, with such, grown people are seldom gratified?

Mr. Wirt's mode of describing persons, manners, or events, generally partakes of the flowery; which is sometimes carried to such excess as to claim close kindred with the ludicrous. He abounds with adjectives. Describing the eloquence of Col. Innis, he says; "It was a short but most bold and terrible assault—a *vehement, impetuous* and *overwhelming burst*—a magnificent *meteor*, which shot majestically across the heavens, *from pole to pole, and straight was seen no more*."

The long and repeated descriptions of Mr. Henry's eloquence, his manners, and the qualities of his mind, which occupy a very large part of the volume, become tiresome. The dictionary appears to have been thoroughly ransacked for all the words that could be applied to eloquence. "In *mild* persuasion he was as *soft* and *gentle* as the zephyr of spring; while, in rousing his countrymen to arms, the winter storm that roars along the *troubled* Baltic, was not more awfully sublime." "His eyes—at one time *piercing* and *terrible* as those of Mars, and then again as *soft* and *tender* as those of pity herself."

Since Horace compared the eloquence of Pindar to a river; *monte decurrens*, &c. the comparison has been frequently used, as it is by Mr. Wirt. But, in page 295, we have a similitude of studied extension, from the rivulet to the ocean. "His eloquence was poured from inexhaustible fountains, and assumed every variety of hue and form and motion, which could delight or persuade, instruct or astonish. Sometimes it was the limped rivulet, sparkling down the mountain's side, and winding its silver course between margins of moss—then gradually swelling to a bolder stream, it roared in the headlong cataract, and spread its rainbows to the sun—now, it flowed on in tranquil majesty, like a river of the *west*, reflecting from its polished surface, forest and cliff and sky—anon, it was the angry ocean, chafed by the tempest, hanging its billows, with deafening clamors, in the cracking shrouds, or hurling them in sublime defiance, at the storm that frowned above."

Shakespeare speaks of the winds taking

——the ruffian billows by the top,
Curling their monstrous heads, and hanging them
With deafning clamors in the slippery shrouds:

but never dreamed of *cracking* shrouds, nor of hurling billows in sublime defiance at a *frowning* storm. Methinks the storm must have more than frowned.

To support the language of such labored attempts on the sublime, so frequent with Mr. Wirt, there ought to be some originality of sentiment or imaginary. Few such are to be found.

In his anxiety to exalt Henry, Mr. W. would lead the reader to suppose that the revolution was begun, continued, and concluded principally by the instrumentality of the orator of Virginia,

Cuncta supercilio moventis,

"who, by his powers of speech, roused the *whole* American people, from north to south; put the revolution in motion, and *bore it upon his* shoulders, as Atlas is said to do [to have done] the heavens—who moved, not merely the populace, the *rocks* and *stones* of the field, but, "by the summit took the mountain oak, and *made* HIM *stoop* to the plain." "It was *he* ALONE, who by *his single power* moved the mighty mass of stagnant water," [referring to the revolution] "and changed the silent *lake* into a roaring *torrent*."

To conclude:—Notwithstanding the omissions and imperfections of this work; it will have great effect in making more generally known the talents, services and character of the great orator of Virginia. It is not a work, however, that will enhance the literary reputation of its author. Mr. Wirt, with most readers, had acquired a large share of *belles-lettres* estimation by his British Spy; in which there is much less of the swelling and of the romantic than are here exhibited. Having advanced so much farther in life, it was reasonable to suppose that most of the *exuviæ* of the sophomore would, long ere this, have been shed: instead of which, his taste seems to be more vitiated; he still mistaking too often the tawdry for the beautiful, and the bombastic for the sublime.

SUBSTANCE

OF

MR. VAN BUREN'S OBSERVATIONS

On Mr. FOOT'S amendment to the Rules of the Senate, by which it was proposed to give the Vice President the right to call to order for words spoken in Debate.

Mr. VAN BUREN said, that he had not been disposed to partake largely in the present debate. He did not believe that any difficulty was likely to arise from leaving the Rules as they had stood from the commencement of the government, and was not at all apprehensive of the undue exercise of the restrictive power now proposed to be conferred on the Vice-President. He had, therefore, felt almost indifferent as to the fate of the amendment; but the progress and character of the discussion had greatly increased the interest of the subject. Principles had been advanced, and earnestly supported, against which he felt it to be his duty, at least to protest. Nay, more; such was his repugnance to the doctrines he had heard, so deep was his conviction of the error in which they were founded, that he could not, without being disloyal to the most sacred of his official duties, refrain from resisting them.

It could not, he was persuaded, be necessary to say, that in expressing himself thus strongly, it was not his intention to question, much less to assail, the motives of those with whom he differed. He was not in the habit of doing so; and, if he could ever so far forget what was due to his brethren, as well as to himself, the sincere personal respect which he felt for the Senator from Louisiana, by whose remarks he had been induced to continue the debate, would restrain him. He had no doubt gentlemen honestly entertained the opinions they had advanced, and it was, therefore, their right to sustain them with the spirit and zeal which they had manifested on the present occasion. It was the correctness, not the integrity, of those opinions that Mr. Van Buren meant to controvert. It was to carry them out to their legitimate results, and present them in their true and exceptionable character, that he had risen. To do this the more effectually, he would endeavor to strip the subject of all irrelevant matter, to check the discursive character of the debate, and bring the questions before the Senate in their natural order and most simple form.

The first of these questions, said he, is the extent of the rights of the Vice President under the rules as they stand. It is one, comparatively speaking, of but little importance. There are but two views in which it can be regarded as at all material. The one relates to the propriety of further legislation on our part; and the other gives it importance only from its bearing upon the correctness of an opinion long since officially expressed by the present presiding officer. Mr. VAN BUREN said he had before remarked upon so much of the subject as relates to the effect of the old rules, and would not now detain the Senate by enlarging on that point. It appeared to him impossible, considering the phraseology and obvious sense of our rules, more especially when taken in connexion with those of the House of Representatives, that intelligent and unprejudiced minds could differ in opinion. The language, said he, is plain; the sense is plain; and from the injurious consequences of a construction imparting this power to the Vice-President, without appeal, it is also plain, that such could not have been their original intent. Indeed, said he, I do not remember that, in the whole debate, it has been distinctly contended that the right given by the rules to Senators to call to order, extended also to the Vice-President. Some gentlemen have, it is true, (to use the language of the law,) by way of excluding a conclusion, imagined that there might be room for question upon the face of the rules; but I am quite confident that it has not been distinctly affirmed that they confer the power in dispute on the Vice-President. Upon the other view of the matter, said Mr. V. B., a single word would suffice. Entirely free, as he could not but be, from personal prejudice on the one

stand, and uninfluenced by individual partiality on the other, he felt no interest in the subject, save a desire which, he hoped was common to all, to see that justice was done to the conduct of a public officer who had discharged his official duties with fidelity and ability. He could not but think that the warmth of personal friendship and the influence of party excitement, combined, had greatly magnified the importance of the matter in relation to the individual concerned. Surely no public man in this country, or in any other where reason and justice sway the public mind, is required to be infallible, or will be held responsible for more than the honesty of his opinions, and the fidelity with which he sustains them. If he err, occasionally, it is because he is human; and so long as his motives, as in the present case, are above suspicion, he has nothing to fear from public censure. But it appeared to him that those who wish a confirmation by the Senate of the opinion heretofore expressed by the Vice-President, so far as the rules are concerned, could not desire a more distinct one than would result from the adoption of the amendment under consideration: for where is the man, in this great community, who would, for a moment, suppose that the Senate of the United States could spend days, not to say weeks, in gravely debating the propriety of conferring upon the Vice-President a power already given by its rules? No one could, he was persuaded, be found capable of such injustice to the body.

He now approached another, and a more important view of the subject. It was the one that had called him up; and for entering upon its consideration he would make no apology. Indeed he would require an apology for himself, were he to omit it. Too much time, he said, could not be employed in probing and discussing a principle, in his view so fallacious and obnoxious as that which had been forced upon their consideration. His examination of it must, at this time, of necessity, be limited. The great principle so freely commented upon by the Senator from Louisiana, growing out of the implied powers claimed for this government, and involving the distinction between such as are true and warranted by the text, and the fraudulent inventions of after times, is a matter of intense interest. A particular discussion, however, of the acts and assumptions referred to by the Senator from Louisiana, would now be out of place. But the period would, he hoped, soon arrive, when an opportunity would be afforded to discuss them at large, uninfluenced by immediate local interests or party considerations. When that day shall arrive—and he hoped it would not be more distant than the next session of Congress—he would if his life were spared, seek occasion to say at least, fearlessly and frankly, all he knew, and all he believed, and all he feared upon the subject.

Failing, said Mr. Van Buren, to find in the rules, their warrant for the power in question, those who affirm its existence claim it under the constitution. With what justice this ground was taken, he would proceed briefly to consider. There are not, said he, greater enemies to the truth than confused and erroneous statements of the question. Their malign influence has been strikingly exerted on the present occasion. To it he attributed differences of opinion between himself and some with whom he seldom differed, and always with reluctance. What, then, said he, is the true question? Is it whether the Vice-President has any power to keep order in the Senate? By no means. No one could contend for a proposition so much at variance with what was every day passing under our eyes. Those who assisted in the formation of this government, were not so ignorant or inexperienced as not to know that an efficient power to preserve order was of vital necessity to every legislative body. It was, therefore, provided by the Constitution, that "each House of Congress may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behaviour, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member." In virtue of this power, the Senate, upon its first organization, adopted a a set of rules prescribing the mode of its proceedings, and containing divers provisions upon the subject of order, declaring what its members might do, and what they should not be permitted to do. The enforcement of these rules is made the duty of the presiding officer, whether he be the Vice-President or President pro tempore. Scarcely a day passes without the performance of some act by the presiding officer, in fulfilment of that duty. It is to these act that gentlemen refer, in order to sustain a claim to a power altogether different. They do not perceive that these are acts of a merely *ministerial character*, in which the chair acts as the organ of the Senate, subject to such control and supervision as this body may, from time to time, prescribe. In cases thus provided for, no difficulty has arisen, or can arise.

Another question has now been made, and it is this: It is contended that in addition to the conceded powers of the Chair upon the subject of order, "*it is competent for the Vice-President to call a Senator to order for words spoken in debate, upon the ground either that they do not relate to the subject under discussion, or on account of their otherwise exceptionable character.*" That right is, by the rules, given to every Senator; but has not yet been conferred on the presiding officer, if, therefore, it exist, it must be derived from a source other than the rules of this House. Driven to this alternative, the gentlemen contend that it is derived from the constitution itself; that it belongs to, and is *inherent* in, the office: and it is to this view of the subject the question owes its great importance. Mr. V. B. said he was at a loss how to treat a pretension, in his conception so extravagant, in a manner consistent with the respect he entertained for those who had advanced it. He had, at an early period of the debate, when it had been alluded to—but not so formally and earnestly insisted on as now—made it his business to discredit, and, as far as allowable, to censure the doctrine contended for. Since that period, the matter had been discussed by his friends—from Delaware, (Mr. McLane,) Tennessee, (Mr. White,) Kentucky, (Mr. Rowan,) and Virginia, (Messrs. Tazewell and Tyler,) in a manner which he could not hope to equal. They had literally left nothing for the advocates of the *inherent power of the Chair* to stand upon. What, said he, are the provisions of the constitution that bear upon the question? By the third section of the first article it is declar-

ed, "that the Vice-President of the United "States shall be President of the Senate; but "SHALL HAVE NO VOTE, UNLESS THEY BE EQUAL-"LY DIVIDED." In the teeth of this express provision, it is gravely contended, not only that he *shall have a vote* when the Senate is *not* equally divided, but that he shall have the *whole vote*; and that, upon a question involving the freedom of debate, and by consequence the interests of our constituents. Again: By the fifth section of the same article, the *rules of order*, and the means of their enforcement are, in terms, subjected to the *legislation of the Senate*: but it is now as gravely contended that, this provision to the contrary notwithstanding, the subject (and as he would hereafter show, the whole subject) rests, by the true construction of the constitution, in the discretion of the Vice President. And what, Sir, said he, is the foundation upon which this high reaching pretension is founded? It is no other than the doctrine of *implied powers*. It is to register this, also, among the constructive powers of the government and its functionaries, that the gentlemen on the other side invoke to their aid a principle which has already done such extensive violence to the constitution—a principle which, as defined and practised upon by many of the public men of the day, leaves no other restriction upon power than the discretion or caprice of its possessor—a principle which, in the sense in which it is understood by many, is never so true to itself as when it is false to the constitution. Relaxed as the sentiments of public men had become in regard to constitutional construction, still he could not have anticipated what appeared to him to be so flagrant a perversion of the doctrine of *implied powers*. What more should he say in reply? The implied power claimed for the Vice President is not only inconsistent with one provision of the constitution, but is expressly inhibited by another. The constitution not only denies to the Vice President this right, by one provision Mr V. B. had read, but expressly places it elsewhere by another which he had also read.

If, said he, direct inconsistency and express inhibition cannot stay the march of implication, then has implication become too rampant for the words of soberness and truth. Let us, for one moment, said Mr. Van Buren, consider the consequences that must result from this doctrine, if, in an evil hour, it should be established. The Senator from Missouri, (Mr. Barton,) was evidently distressed by the consciousness of the alarming character of those consequences. He had endeavored to relieve himself by saying that this power would be subject to the regulation of the Senate, and, if abused, might be controlled by its rules. But, said Mr. Van Buren, this attempt does not exhibit the precision and correctness by which the views of that gentleman are frequently recommended to our notice. He must either abandon his position, or seek other relief from the consequences of his own argument. If the power in dispute belongs to the office—if, as gentlemen say, it be inherent in the office, and be made so by the constitution, it is wholly *beyond our legislation*. We have no right to touch it: to do so would be a high-handed encroachment upon the constitutional rights of the second officer of the government. The power conferred upon him by our rules, upon the subject of order, is under our control. In these, *his ministerial* duties, he is our servant, and subject to our law. But you now propose to concede to him a high *judicial power*, and you trace his title to it to an authority higher than your own; an authority paramount to all—the constitution.

You might, said Mr. V. B., with as much propriety undertake to explain, modify or control the executive power of the President of the United States by your rules, as to control this power, if it springs directly from the constitution. Gentlemen must excuse him, if laying out of view the words in which they see fit to clothe their propositions, he held them responsible in argument for their legitimate results. A course different from this would neither comport with the dignity of the occasion, nor the interest awakened by the subject. Among those results were the following:—If the Vice-President be made, by the constitution, the judge of the propriety of our debate, and has the right to call us to order, when, in his discretion, he may think we violate that propriety; then are his rights and duties, in that respect, not only not subject to our legislation, but he would become the *sole judge* of the extent of this power, and the means of enforcing it, without any other direct responsibility than that secured by the right of impeachment. Then, too, has he the right to enforce his decision by punishing disobedience, and all the power of the Senate upon the subject must be subordinate to his. It was, in his judgment, idle to talk about the power to keep order without the means of enforcing decisions by punishment for disorder. The framers of the constitution had taken a better view of the matter, by giving to the Senate the right to punish for disorder, even to expulsion, as a necessary part of its control over the subject. If a similar power in the Vice-President be implied by the constitution, the means to enforce it are also implied. If a power in the Vice-President to call to order for words spoken in debate be implied, he must decide upon all questions growing out of its exercise, without being subjected to the control of the Senate. For, unless the positive provision of the Constitution is to be disregarded, he cannot vote with us unless the Senate be equally divided. These are, then, separate and distinct powers, traced to the same source, and acting upon the same subject matter; and one or the other must be supreme, or the whole will be vain and inoperative. Suppose the Senate, by its rules, allow to be in order what the Vice President, in virtue of his inherent right, holds to be out of order, which is to prevail?

The result, then, said Mr. V. B., of the doctrine contended for, when stripped of all unnecessary verbiage and extraneous considerations, is no more nor less than this: that it is within the constitutional competency of the Vice President, if, in the exercise of his best discretion, he thinks a Senator urges exceptionable matter in debate, or insist on matter that is irrelevent, to prohibit the prosecution of the debate, except upon such terms and in such form, as the Vice President shall prescribe, and to exercise the means necessary to carry that power into effect, without authority or responsibility to this body, or to the individual Senators, save through impeachment.

He asked the indulgence of the Senate, whilst he submitted a few observations upon the character of the power proposed to be conceded to the Vice President, as appertaining to his office, and the nature and importance of the rights of the Senate now proposed to be surrendered. When I speak of their importance, I do not mean in reference to us, but to our constituents.

For what must be the character of the collisions which, in the course of events, can alone be expected to produce any thing like a marked exercise of this great power to control debate? Is it at all likely that they will arise from personal altercations among ourselves? Surely not. For their suppression the present means are ample. The Constitution and the rules of the Senate made under it, afford of themselves an ample shield for individual protection, if any shield be necessary; and he hoped no one would suppose that so craven a spirit existed within these walls as to make it necessary or even desirable to place this power in the hands of the Vice President, because we might be unwilling to protect ourselves. He was quite confident that no danger was to be apprehended from that quarter. *If strong ground is ever taken upon this subject, said he, it will arise out of the intercourse of this body with the co-ordinate, and in some sense rival, departments of this government.* It is from our acts as they bear upon the Executive and its inferior functionaries, and upon the Judiciary and its subordinates, that such a proceeding can alone be expected. From the present condition of things, abuse in that respect might not be likely to take place. But the present is not the natural state of things. In general, the President and Vice President will belong to the same political party. It is only when "times are out of joint," that they will be be taken from different sides. The present case is an exception growing out of that cause. In considering the future, you must contemplate a different condition of things, or you will not act wisely. It is only to guard against the abuses of political trust that constitutional restrictions are provided. Were it not for the inherent and inextinguishable disposition of man to abuse delegated power, they would not be necessary. Who, said he, can be blind to the consequences, that in the political agitations of the times, may be fairly apprehended from the possession of this power by the Vice President? Who cannot see what a tremendous engine it may become in the hands of an ambitious and *still aspiring* Executive? That it may give him, through the agency of his political friend and coadjutor in this body, a complete and irresistable control over the debates of its members, and consequently over the extent and character of the information on public affairs to be given through us to the people?

The connexion of the Executive with the Senate is much closer than with the House of Representatives. Upon the subject of treaties, appointments, and the whole range of Executive business, the Senate is almost the only check. It is, therefore, of vital importance, that it should be wholly exempt from Executive control. This body was looked to by the framers of the Constitution, as a sanctuary for the federal and equal rights of the States, and so framed as to cherish that sentiment on the part of its members. It is here alone that the federal principle had been preserved: a principle valuable to all, but particularly to the small States; for it is in this department alone that their perfect equality is recognised. But where, Sir, will be its efficiency, if the doctrine contended for be established? When, hereafter, a Senator shall feel it to be his duty to attempt in language which he may think the occasion requires, to arrest encroachment of the Executive, or to seek redress by exposing abuses of trust on its part, or that of any of its subordinates, he may find his lips closed, not indeed, as of old, by a *gag law*, but by a power far more effectual. He may perhaps be told, that although it is his right to canvass freely, the public acts of the President and his cabinet, it must be done in a manner more decorous; that their motives are not to be rudely scanned and discredited; that debates of that character, having a tendency unjustly to alienate the confidence of the people, are out of order; that if he will shape his periods according to the prescribed form, and measure the extent and bitterness of his denunciation by the administration standard, he may go on—but if not, he must desist.

If, said he, it should hereafter become manifest to a portion, or even a majority of this House, that the third power of the Federal Government, created and supported by the other two, is gradually, though to the great mass of the people imperceptibly, subverting the reserved rights of the States, and undermining the Constitution of the United States, in some of its most essential points; and if, on a subject of such vital importance, the representative of a sovereign State should express himself on this floor in a manner calculated to suppress the mischief, but yet without just offence to propriety, he may expect to be told from that Chair, that although the acts of a co-ordinate branch of the government, when coming properly before the Senate, are liable to free examination; yet the ermine of justice is not to be thus rudely assailed within these walls. Could there, he asked, be any principle which would more effectually prostrate the independence of this body? And was it to be endured, that the members of the Senate should hold the invaluable right of free debate by so frail and humiliating a tenure? In his opinion the Senate would be wanting in what is owed to its constituents, to itself, to its true interests and dignity, if it could for a moment lend its sanction to a principle so untenable and so dangerous. The Senate, heretofore, he said, had not been insensible to what belonged to its rights. It was but the session before the last that the Executive, in a communication to us, advanced a pretension incompatible with the constitutional rights of the Senate. And how was it received? It was not the exercise, but merely the assertion of a power, on his part—an assertion, it is true, wholly unsupportable; and he believed no one would deny, most unwisely put forth. And how, he asked again, had it been treated? Resolutions were introduced denouncing the unfounded assumption as an Executive encroachment that ought to be resisted. A disposition to do so, and to preserve and maintain the just rights of the body, not on our own account, but in behalf of those who sent us here, was then

manifested, that in his judgment reflected the highest honor on the body. The question then agitated could not be compared, in point of importance, with that now under consideration. At most, it was a threatened trespass upon the constitutional rights of this House. What have we here? A principle which lays the axe at the root of the independence of the Senate, and the personal and dearest privileges of its members.

In every point of view, said Mr. V. B., in which this subject had presented itself to his mind, it had produced but one sentiment, and that was unqualified opposition to the *prerogative* claimed for the chair. Although this claim of power is now for the first time made, the *principle* in which it originates is as old as the government itself. I look upon it, Sir, as the legitimate offspring of a school of politics, which has, in times past, agitated and greatly disturbed this country—of a school, the leading principle of which may be traced to that great source of the political contentions which have pervaded every country where the rights of man were in any degree respected. I allude, Sir, to that collision which seems to be inseparable from the nature of man, between the rights of the *few* and the *many*—to those never-ceasing conflicts between the advocats of the *enlargement* and *concentration* of power on the one hand, and its *limitation* and *distribution* on the other: Conflicts which, in England, created the distinction between Whigs and Tories: the latter striving by all the means within their reach to increase the dominion and influence of the throne, at the expense of the commons and people; and the former to counteract the exertions of their adversaries, by abridging that dominion and influence for the advancement of the rights and the consequent amelioration of the condition of the people.

Collisions of opinion and of action of a character similar in principle have existed, although under different denominations, with different limits, and for different ends, in most countries, and in an eminent degree in this. Indeed the history of the struggles, the contests, the alternating victories and defeats of these two restless and rival principles, is the history of all republican governments—in fact, of all institutions formed for the protection of the liberty of conscience and opinion, and the freedom of the citizen. No where can its operation be more distinctly traced than in our own early history They were the primitive elements, and animating causes of those Whig and Tory parties, which, from the first Congress of 1765, down to the glorious peace of 1783, on the one hand labored unceasingly to consolidate all legislative authority over these provinces in the single British Parliament, and to place all patronage, power, and influence in the hands of the executive and judicial representatives of the *Crown;* and on the other hand, as boldly and perseveringly, but happily more successfully, vindicated by reason, eloquence, and finally by arms, the rights of the several American States, and the just powers of the immediate representatives of the *people*. The establishment of our independence put an end to these conflicts, in the form in which they had before been sustained; but what its effect was upon the spirit that produced them, could be better judged from an attentive consideration of our subsequent history. Attempts, said Mr Van Buren, have frequently been made in later days, and recently by the highest authority in the government,* to trace the origin of the two great political parties which have divided the country, from the adoption of the Constitution to the present day. They have, for motives too obvious to require explanation, been attributed to causes which had either become obsolete, or been compromised by mutual concession—such as the early difficulties growing out of our relations with Great Britain and France, the expediency of a navy, or similar questions. There was one consideration, he said, that could not fail to arrest the attention of the most superficial observer It was this. If these party divisions have sprung from no other cause than the temporary circumstances to which they have been attributed, why have they so long survived the causes that produced them? That they still exist, and exist in full vigor in a great portion of the Union, it would be an insult to our observation and understanding to deny. The explanation of the mystery was to be found, and to be found only, in the falsity of the ascription. They arose from other and very different causes. They are in truth, said he, mainly to be ascribed to the struggle between the two opposing principles that have been in active operation in this country from the closing scenes of the revolutionary war to the present day—the one seeking to absorb, as far as practicable, all power from its legitimate sources, and to condense it in a single head: The other, an antagonist principle, laboring as assiduously to resist the encroachments, and limit the extent of executive authority. *The former has grown out of a deep and settled distrust of the People and of the States.* It consequently regards as gain, every thing that can be drawn into the vortex of federal power, and as making that power still more safe in proportion as it is withdrawn from the popular departments of the federal government to those that are further removed from the control of public sentiment. *The antagonist principle has its origin in a jealousy of power, justified by all human experience.* It is founded on the assumption, that the disposition of man to abuse delegated authority is inherent and incorrigible; it therefore seeks its only security in the limitation and distribution of those trusts which the very existence of government requires to be reposed somewhere. Hence, the aversion of its supporters to grant more power than is indispensibly necessary for the objects of society; and their desire, as an additional safeguard, to place that which is conferred in as many hands as is consistent with efficiency. The former is essentially the *monarchical*, and the latter the *democratical* spirit of society. He wished not to be misunderstood. He used these terms as more expressive of his meaning, than any that occurred to him. He had no idea that all, or even the great body of those who either now, or in times past, had been subject to the influence of the first principle, were in favor of the establishment of a monarchy in this country, any more than he believed that those who had shown their preference for democratical principles were in favor of the establishment of an absolute democracy—

* Inaugural Address.

neither side had views thus extensive. The forms of both were repudiated, while their respective spirits were, to no inconsiderable extent, retained. The earlier battles upon this cardinal point were fought upon the question of the degree of *energy*; or in other words, *power* that ought to be given to the federal government, at the expense of the States and the people. They commenced in the Convention of 1787, and soon spread through the great body of the people upon the question of ratification. The proceedings of that Convention were for a long time secret, but are now before the public. In them, when taken in connexion with later events, we read the grounds of our subsequent political dissensions in language so plain, that none but those who are wilfully blind can be deceived. There were of course, different degrees, as to individuals; but the leading division in the Convention was between those who, distrustful of the States, sought to abridge their powers, that those of the new government might thereby be enlarged, and those who, on their part, distrustful, perhaps jealous of the government about to be created, and possessing full confidence in those of the States, were as strenuous to retain all powers not indispensibly necessary to enable the federal government to discharge the specified and limited duties to be imposed upon it. The contest was animated, and, as is well known, more than once threatened a dissolution of the Convention, without agreeing upon any thing. Necessity, however, ultimately compelled a compromise. The terms were arranged as well as practicable. The then friends of State rights, (the true *federalists*, but who, by a singular misnomer, were immediately after called *anti-federalists*, whilst those who had throughout opposed the federal principle, assumed the then more popular name of federalists,) succeeded, or thought they succeeded, in saving much of what they had so earnestly contended for. The advocates of what was in the language of the day called a *strong General Government*, certainly failed in obtaining by express grant, or necessary implication, much of what they had so long and so ably struggled to acquire for the new Government. The question of ratification came on, and was full of difficulty. The abuses to which some of the more general provisions of the Constitution might be exposed, were pointed out by its opponents. The concealed powers of the Constitution, which are at this day put forth with so much confidence, were disclaimed and condemned by those who advocated the ratification. No candid and well-informed man, will for a moment, pretend that, if the powers now claimed for this Government had been avowed at the time, or even had not been expressly disclaimed, there would have been the slightest chance for the adoption of the Constitution, by the requisite number of the old thirteen States.*

*It is within the recollection of the Senate, that one of the then surviving members of the Convention of 1787, (the late Mr. King,) toward the close of his long and useful public life, declared on the floor of the Senate, that the framers of the Constitution never contemplated the exercise of such powers by the Federal Government, as were now claimed for it upon the subject of Internal Improvements, and that had it been supposed that such powers were conferred, the Constitution never could have been ratified.

But it was ratified, said Mr. V. B., *and from the moment of its adoption to the present day, the spirit he had described, had been at work to obtain by construction* what was not included or intended to be included in the grant.* It was far from his intention to urge this as a reproach against the actors in those scenes. He was persuaded that the motives of many, if not of all, were pure, and even patriotic. They believed that the State Governments were not safe depositories of power: that the States would be able to control, and would injuriously control the Federal Government, unless it had more power than the Convention of 1787 was willing to grant. They thought, and one of them with that ingeniousness of feeling which distinguished his noble nature, avowed officially, that the true question was, not what the framers of the Constitution intended, or what those by whom it was ratified understood, but what was the correct construction of the terms in which it was expressed. This great man knew well that the power then claimed for the Government, could be sustained on no other grounds, and he was always above disguise.

I am not, said Mr. V. B., condemning their motives, but controverting their opinions. The test that was then applied to the Constitution has been adjudged erroneous and unjust, by the judges in the last resort—*the people themselves*. The belief (no doubt honestly entertained by many) that its application was necessary to the success of the scheme and to the welfare of the country, was founded in impressions as to the character of the State Governments, which experience has demonstrated to have been unfounded. Many of the most distinguished of those who then entertained those opinions, have since abandoned them, convinced by the results of that experiment which has since been made. Fifty years experience of the operation of the State Governments, has made "assurance doubly sure," that they richly deserve the confidence which the people have ever been inclined to bestow on them. Under the broad shield of State laws, private rights have been protected, while public prosperity was promoted. In the darkest hours of war, when the general Government was disheartened and enfeebled by debt and disaster, its unnerved arm was strengthened, and the national honor rescued, by the authority, the patriotism, and the credit of the

*An anecdote is related of the late Governeur Morris, a conspicuous and efficient member of the Convention, and great latitudinarian, which is entitled to credit, from its being so strikingly characteristic of the man. Being at the city of New York, a short time after the ratification by the requisite number of States was known, he was congratulated upon the successful termination of their labors in the establishment of a Constitution that would realize all the great objects of its framers. "*That depends upon how it is construed*," was, at that early day, when no question of construction could by possibility have arisen, his pregnant reply.

States. In peace they have not only fulfilled wisely and justly all the great purposes of self-government, but several of them have established noble systems of public instruction, or have accomplished or are now accomplishing great works of internal improvement, as far surpassing in magnitude and utility any similar works of the general government, as they do in wisdom of plan and economy and judgment in execution. *A general surrender of such opinions, is, therefore, at this time, a tribute justly due to the redeemed and established character of the State governments.* But they are not surrendered—on the contrary, they have become more and more extravagant, until those under whose protection they now are, claim for this government powers which were in express terms repudiated and denounced by the founders of this very school

Mr. V. B. said, he would not feel himself at liberty to detain the Senate by following the track of the government in its whole extent, and through all its sinuosities to establish his positions, but he could not avoid doing so in part. The subject was one of deep interest, of which it behooved the American people to be fully informed, but which it was to be feared is more frequently spoken of than understood. The mass of our citizens are so much engrossed in the affairs of their State governments, that this great matter is in no inconsiderable degree neglected.

During the administration of General Washington, no acts of a strong character took place, save the incorporation of the Bank of the United States, that great *pioneer* of constitutional encroachments, together with the principles avowed in relation to the treaty making power. The attachment of General Washington to the constitution, his consciousness of the difficulties which had attended its establishment, and the natural moderation of his character, coming in aid of the firm countenance maintained by the anti-federalists of that day, kept the spirit of encroachment and construction within bounds, that, compared with its present character, were reasonable. But in the administration succeeding that of General Washington, continuing through the years 1797, '98, '99, it displayed itself in its true and most odious character. Its fruits were so bitter, and are so well remembered, that any thing like a minute description of them would be an act of supererogation. It was then that the monarchical and aristocratical character of the spirit he had described, was displayed in unceasing efforts to wrest from the States the powers that justly belonged to them, to exercise such as had never been conferred, and to concentrate, as far as practicable, all authority in the hands of the President.

Among the usurpations of that day the alien and sedition laws stand in bold relief, not only as furnishing land marks of the extent to which the presumption and arrogance of power dared to go, but also on account of their agency in driving from public confidence those by whom they were adopted. The inclination to draw the powers of the government to one common focus, has been otherwise exemplified in various ways, and at different periods of our history. Time would only allow a brief notice of one or two of them.

The doctrine announced in the discussions on the British treaty, that the House of Representatives were bound to make all appropriations necessary to carry into effect the stipulations of a treaty made by the President and Senate, was a striking exemplification of this truth. The extent to which this doctrine increases the Executive power (in its most enlarged sense) over the funds of the nation, cannot fail to strike the mind at the first blush. He did not wish to be understood as saying, or insinuating, that all who advocated that opinion, were influenced by the spirit of which he had spoken. He did not believe that such was the case. On the contrary, he was well satisfied that there were those, on that occasion, as well as on that of the incorporation of the Bank of the United States, (and especially him who was at the head of affairs,) who were sincere friends to the State governments, but were led away by the pressure of the times, and gave their assent to measures which, under more auspicious circumstances, they could not have approved. The principle then avowed was resisted by the republicans of that day, on the simple but intelligible grounds, that, so far as the treaty stipulation could be carried into effect without the aid of the House of Representatives, its interference would be unauthorized, because, by the constitution, the treaty-making power had been conferred on a different department of the government; but that, whenever the action of the House of Representatives, the more immediate agents of the people, was necessary, it must be free to give or withhold its assent, according to its best judgment, and upon its own responsibility: that the constitution neither declared nor intended, that, in cases which might be of the greatest magnitude, it should be a mere machine to be worked by the other departments of the government. The same disposition to limit the powers of the popular branch, was forcibly illustrated in the discussions on the "*Foreign Intercourse Bill*" in 1798. It was upon that occasion contended, and successfully too, that the House of Representatives had no discretion upon the question of appropriation for the expenses of such intercourse with foreign nations as the President saw fit to establish—that they would be justly obnoxious to the imputation of gross delinquency, if they hesitated to make provision for the salaries of such foreign ministers as the President, with the assent of the Senate, should appoint. What would be the feelings of real and unchanged republicans in relation to such doctrines at this day? Associated with them was the bold avowal, that it belonged to the President alone to decide upon the propriety of the mission, and that all the constitutional agency which the Senate could of right have, was to pass on the fitness of the individuals selected as ministers. It was pretentions like these, said Mr. Van Buren, aided by unceasing indications, both in the internal and external movements of the government, that produced a deep and settled conviction in the public mind that a design had been conceived to change the government from its simple and republican form, to one, if not monarchical, at least too *energetic* for the temper of the American people—a conviction which, beyond all doubt, produced the civil revolution of 1800, and for which no "oblivious antidote" has been yet discovered by those who were its

victims. By that great event, the public sentiment was improved, our public councils purified, the spirit of encroachment severely rebuked, and, it was then hoped, extinguished forever. During Mr. Jefferson's Administration, and with a single exception, that of Mr. Madison, the government was administered upon the principles which the framers of the Constitution avowed, and which their constituents had ratified, and the people once and again confirmed. The charter of the Bank of the United States, was, after a hard struggle, suffered to expire; and the conceded and well-understood powers of the government were found amply sufficient to enable it to perform the great functions for which it was instituted. During a great portion of the time the country was blessed with a degree of prosperity and happiness without a parellel in the world. At the close of Mr. Madison's Administration, a new bank was incorporated, and received his reluctant assent. It would be shutting our eyes to the truth to deny, or to attempt to conceal the fact, that that assent, coming from the quarter that it did, has had a most powerful and far from salutary influence on the subsequent course of the government. Its author had himself, on a former occasion, demonstrated the want of power in the federal government to incorporate a bank, and his assent was now placed on the express ground that the recognition of the authority of the government in relation to the old Bank by the State governments, and the Courts, as well as the people, had precluded the question of constitutionality. Thus the power in question must stand as a successful interpolation upon the text of the Constitution. This great precursor was again followed by other attempts, but of a restricted and qualified character, to extend the same principle to other topics of legislation. They were, however, promptly defeated by Mr. Madison, who, upon all points, save the Bank of the United States, preserved inviolate the great principles upon which the revolution of 1800 was founded, and of which his own report upon the Alien and Sedition Laws was the exposition. For his departure, in that particular, (if a departure it was,) his reasons have been seen. It is not at this time my official duty to pass upon their sufficiency; and I am wholly unwilling to volunteer a denunciation of any opinion, deliberately formed, and upon high responsibility, by one of the most, if not *the* most, accomplished ststesman that our country has produced. However individuals might differ as to the correctness of his conclusion, all mankind must acquiesce in the purity of the motives which led to its adoption. The political condition of the country at the close of the late war, in reference to old party distinctions, speculation as to the future, and the aspirations of individual ambition, accompanied, in many cases, by a sincere desire to promote the public good, produced occasional attempts during the administration that followed, to revive in a form less exceptionable the doctrine which had already been so emphatically condemned by the people. They were, however, in a great degree, restrained, and kept down by the resistance of the remnant of the faithful, and the qualified opposition of Mr. Monroe.*

But if these attempts, said Mr. V. B., to revive the condemned heresies of former times, were not of themselves successful, they served the purpose of giving countenance to pretensions on the part of men now in power, which out-Herod Herod. The opening scenes of the present Administration have not only been the subjects of intense interest in their day, but will mark an interesting era in our future history. They will stand as a beacon to succeeding Administrations, warning them of the point beyond which the people will never tolerate encroachment upon the great charter of their liberties. The present Executive, in his exposition of the constitutional powers of this government, has gone far beyond the utmost latitude of construction heretofore claimed,* as if to give point to

---

* Mr. Van Buren is by no means certain that, in this respect, he himself, has been altogether without fault. At the very first session he came into the Senate, the knowledge of the perpetual drain that the Cumberland Road was destined to prove upon the public treasury, unless some means were taken to prevent it, and a sincere desire to go at all times, as far as he could, consistently with the Constitution, to aid in the improvement, and promote the prosperity of the Western Country, had induced him, without full examination, to vote for a provision, authorizing the collection of toll on the road. The affair of the Cumberland Road, in respect to its reference to the constitutional powers of this government, is a matter entirely *sui generis*. It was authorized during the administration of Mr. Jefferson, grew out of the disposition of the territory of the United States, and had the consent of the States through which it passed. He has never heard an explanation of the subject, (although it has been a matter of constant reference,) that has been satisfactory to his mind. All he can say, is, that if the question were again presented to him, he would vote against it; and that his regret for having done otherwise would be the greater, had not Mr. Monroe, much to his credit, put his veto upon the bill, and were it not, as far as he knows, the only vote, in the course of a seven year's service, which the most fastidious critic can torture into an inconsistency with the principles which Mr. V. B. professed to maintain, and in the justice of which he is every day more and more confirmed.

* *Mr. Adams' Ohio letter, during the canvass of* 1824

"The question of the power of Congress to authorize the making of internal improvements, is, in other words, a question whether the people of this Union, in forming their common social compact, as avowedly for the purpose of promoting their general welfare, have performed their work in a manner so ineffably stupid, as to deny themselves the means of bettering their own condition. I have too much respect for the intellect of my country to believe it. *The first object of human association is the improvement of the condition of the associated. Roads and Canals are among the most essential means of improving the condition of nations; and a people, which should deliberately, by the organization of its authorized power, deprive itself of the faculty of multiplying its own blessings, would be as wise*

his extravagant pretensions—to demonstrate that the result of the last election was not only the restoration of the men of 1798, but of the principles of that day, we have seen a great portion of the obnoxious doctrine then contended for again broadly advanced in the assumption that it was within the "constitutional competency" of the Executive to have sent Ministers to the Congress of Panama, without the assent of the Senate: and, Sir, to give a high finish to the picture, it is now strenuously contended, from a quarter in amity with the Executive, that the control of the rights and privileges of the Senators, on this floor, and their constituents, in a most essential particular, is a power *inherent* in the office of the Vice-President of the United States. I have, Sir, been brought up in opposition to that school of politics from which such principles are legitimate emanations. From my first acquaintance with public affairs to the present day, I have regarded it as a sacred duty to resist them; and I consider myself, on this occasion, as in the discharge of that duty. The grave matters of which I have spoken, with much more of what I might have spoken as daily passing before our eyes, are, as has been before observed, identical in principle with those which were so emphatically adjudged against by the people in 1800.* They

---

as a Creator who should undertake to constitute a human being without a heart."

Inaugural Address.

"Whatsoever is of domestic concernment, unconnected with the other members of the Union, or with foreign lands, belongs exclusively to the administration of the State governments. Whatsoever directly involves the rights and interests of the federative fraternity, or of foreign powers, is of the resort of this general government. The duties of both are obvious in the general principle, though sometimes perplexed with difficulties in the detail."

President's first message to Congress.

"Upon this first occasion of addressing the Legislature of the Union, with which I have been honored, in presenting to their view the execution, so far as it has been effected, of the measures sanctioned by them for promoting the internal improvement of our country, I cannot close the comunication without recommending to their calm and persevering consideration, the general principle in a more enlarged extent. *The great object of the institution of civil government is the improvement of the condition of those who are parties to the social compact. And no government, in whatever form constituted, can accomplish the lawful ends of its institution, but in proportion as it improves the condition of those over whom it is established.* Roads and canals, by multiplying and facilitating the communications and intercourse between distant regions and multitudes of men, are among the most important means of improvement. *But moral, political, intellectual improvement, are duties assigned, by the Author of our existence, to social, no less than to individual man. For the fulfilment of those duties, governments are invested with power; and, to the attainment of the end, the progressive improvement of the condition of the governed, the exercise of delegated powers is a duty as sacred and indispensable, as the usurpation of powers not granted is criminal and odious.*"

The principle of constitutional construction contained in the Ohio letter is distinctly repeated in the first message. In both, the powers of

---

* Extract from the speech of James A. Bayard, on the Judiciary Bill, in 1802:

"We were next told of the parties which "have existed, divided by the opposite views "of promoting executive power, and guarding "the rights of the people. The gentleman "did not tell us in plain language, but he "wished it to be understood that he and his "friends were the guardians of the people's "rights, and that we were the advocates of "executive power.

"I know that this is the distinction of a party "which some gentlemen have been anxious to "establish; but it is not the ground on which "we divide. I am satisfied with the constitutional powers of the executive, and never "wished or attempted to increase them; and I "do not believe that gentlemen on the other "side of the house ever had a serious apprehension of danger from an increase of executive authority. *No, Sir, our views as to the "powers which do and ought to belong to the "General and State Governments, are the true "sources of our divisions.* I co-operate with "the party to which I am attached, because I "believe their true object and end is an honest "and efficient support of the General Government in the exercise of the legitimate powers "of the Constitution.

"I pray to God I may be mistaken in the "opinion I entertain as to the designs of gentlemen to whom I am opposed. Those designs "I believe hostile to the powers of this Government. State pride extinguishes national "sentiment. Whatever is taken from this Government is given to the States."

Better authority, as to the old lines of party division, could not on one side be referred to than that of Mr. Bayard. Although a zealous partizan, he did, not when his country was at war, forget that he was an American citizen. His noble bearing at that perilous crisis, broke down the partition wall between him and his old opponents; and there is every reason to believe, that if the councils of the country had been favored with the continuance of his splendid talents to the present period, the exemplary and efficient conduct of the States, the gradual and permanent improvements of their systems, together with the constantly accumulating evidence of the proneness of this Government, to extend and abuse its powers, would have made the same impression on his mind, that they have on the minds of many, who once thought as he did.

---

the federal government are referred, not to the enumeration and specification of them made with so much care by those who framed the Constitution, but *to the great purposes for which government are instituted, and the duties assigned by the Author of our existence, to social man:* subjecting, of course, the questions as to what those "great purposes" and "duties," and the consequent powers of the federal government are, to no other restraints than the discretion of those who hold the reins.

Is it not most preposterous, with such expositions of the Constitution, to talk of this as a

are presented in a different and far more dangerous form; but they are, nevertheless, the same. The spirit of encroachment has, it is true, become more wary, but it is not a bit more honest. Heretofore the system was *coercion;* now it is *seduction.* Heretofore unconstitutional powers were exercised to *force* submission, now they are assumed to *purchase* golden opinions from the people with their own means. It is a great mistake, Sir, to attribute the radical change in government, effected cotemporaneously with the election of Mr. Jefferson, either to excess of taxation, or practical oppression under the Alien and Sedition laws. Those doubtless produced great and just excitement; but it did not belong to their nature to produce such lasting consequences. Acts of individual oppression had been committed before, and have, in different degrees, been committed since. But, after having caused more or less of public excitement at the time, they have passed away with the occasion that produced them. Such is human nature now—such has it been in all ages of the world. The acts I have alluded to, highly exceptionable as they undoubtedly were, could never have produced an unyielding *exclusion from the confidence of a majority of the people, for more than a quarter of a century, of large masses of men distinguished for talent and private worth.* No, Sir, said he, the cause of that great and glorious struggle lies deeper—much deeper. It proceeded, not from the consequences of those acts, but from an opposition to the principle upon which they were founded—*that principle was an alarming extension of the constructive powers of this government*—it arose, as he had before said, from a settled conviction in the minds of the people, that a deliberate plan had been formed by the men then in power, to change the government, from its true republican form, to one, if not monarchical, at least too much inclined to that direction. It was the apprehension that they were about to be despoiled of the promised fruits of the Revolution, that aroused and called into vigorous action that same great spirit by which the Revolution itself was accomplished. It is to that cause only that results unknown to the politics of any other country are to be attributed. The cause was at least adequate, if *all* the consequences have not been permanent. And what is the true character of the times upon which, in the course of events, and the providence of God, we have fallen? Most unpropitious, truly.

If the views in relation to the powers of this government, avowed by the present Executive, and which lie at the foundation of the present administration, are the true doctrines of the Constitution, *then was the great political Revolution of* 1800 *founded in gross error, if not palpable fraud upon the people*"—Disguise the matter as you will, said he, "to this complexion must we come at last." It was most manifest, he said, that whatever effect the events of 1797–8–9 and 1800 had had upon the Federal *men* of that day, their consequences upon the *principles* that then prevailed, have not been as effectual as was hoped, and for a season believed.

"We have scotched the snake, not killed it;
She'll close and be herself again."

But he trusted the prediction would not be verified. *She'll not close again.* The people will prevent it. He must indeed be a miserable judge of public sentiment, who cannot see in its daily indications that the same spirit which once before rescued the Constitution from the hands of its enemies, is at this moment fully roused. The excesses of the last three years have produced in this country changes of public opinion, wholly without precedent. The time, he trusted, was not far distant, when the interpolations which had been attempted upon the Constitution, with the wretched sophisms by which they were supported, will be subjects of severe reprehension; nay, of derision with the people, and when a great portion of the talents that have been employed in weaving the net, will need all its own ingenuity to escape its meshes. He hoped he had not been understood as supposing that all who had heretofore been ranked among the supporters of the high-toned doctrines he had condemned, must of consequence occupy the same station now. By no means. He would be ashamed of himself to be found the author of sentiments so contracted and illiberal. He knew too well that, although, to a certain extent, names are things, they are not always the unerring evidence of the things they signify. *The full experiment in peace and in war which we have now had of the respective operations and efficiency of the Federal and State governments, ought to satisfy every dispassionate inquirer after truth of the fallacy of opinions once so extensively entertained.* Those who thought so ought to abandon them, and all who are wise enough to be honest, will do so. It is of itself immaterial by what political appellation men have heretofore been called. The great question is—what are honestly their present sentiments upon those great points, which have, from the beginning, divided the American People, and would, he feared, continue to do so to the end?

Mr. Van Buren said that, contrary to his first impression, he would vote in favor of the whole amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut. He would do so, because it would be the most effectual manner in which he could assist in putting down what, with all respect for the opinions of his fellow Senators, he could not but regard as a monstrous construction of the constitution. The amendment proposed an appeal from the decision of the Vice President to the Senate. If he believed that the Vice President possessed the power in question, by virtue of his office, he could not vote for so great an encroachment upon his constitutional rights as to subject their exercise to a supervision not provided for by the constitution. If, therefore, the amendments were adopted, he hoped we should hear no more of an *inherent right*, which you, Sir, have, much to your credit, refused to usurp, and which we, as I cannot but think to our discredit, are attempting to force upon you. *Nolens volens.*

---

government of *specific* and *limited* powers? Would Alexander Hamilton, who was certainly among the most high-toned advocates of the constructive powers of this government, not have blushed to have had such doctrines attributed to him? His disclaimer of the authority now claimed for the federal government over the subject of internal improvements, is upon record, and there is in existence other and still more ample evidence of his dissent.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*, subject to newspaper postage and *no more*.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, APRIL 30, 1828. No. 8.

From the Baltimore Republican.

THE "SIX MILITIA MEN."

We are aware, that many persons are sick, tired, and disgusted with this subject—looking upon it as a disgraceful electioneering trick of a desperate party; but there are many also, who have been imposed upon with regard to it, by the bold falsehoods of the Adams party, and who only want information, to make them revolt at the infamous imposition, which has been put upon them by that party. We ask such to give an attentive perusal to the letter, and documents accompanying it, which we have received from the Hon. J. K. Polk, of the House of Representatives, and which we publish to-day. The letter of Mr. Polk is a clear exposition of this matter; and the documents with which he has accompanied it, put some of the points, which have been disputed, beyond all doubt.

We ask the reader's attention to the order of Governor Blount, and the Address of General Jackson to the "Brave Tennesseans," and ask him, if he has any longer doubts, that these "Six militia men" were ordered out for the term of SIX months. We ask him, if he any longer doubts, that they *knew* they were called out for SIX months. Does not Gov. Blount's order to Gen. Jackson expressly state it? Does not Gen. Jacksun's Address to them apprise them of it?

We ask bim to read the letter of the Hon. Edward Livingston, and tell us, if the assertion of the Adams party, that the "Six militia men" were executed *after* the news, or the rumor of *Peace* had reached New Orleans, is not an infamous lie. Was not the first news, the first rumor of Peace, brought to New Orleans by Mr. Livingston? And at what time does he fix it? On the 18th or 19th of *February*. When did Gen. Jackson *approve the sentence of the Court Martial?* On the *twenty-second of January*—27 days *before even a rumor of Peace.*

We ask him to read the letter of Major Armstrong, and tell us, if he does not feel convinced, that the execution of the "six militia men" was necessary as an example to the army then lying at Mobile? Were not our troops there restless under their privations, and ready to break out into acts of insubordination? And if these outrageous mutineers and deserters had been pardoned before their eyes, would not they too, *have been encouraged to mutiny and desert?* Was there no danger from the *enemy?* Does not Major Armstrong tell us, that they were *in daily expectation of an attack from the enemy?* Had'nt they actually taken possession of Dauphin Island? Major Armstrong tells us too, that the rumor of Peace had not reached Mobile, when the execution took place—that there was but one sentiment prevailed in the army with regard to their execution—that of approval of it—that its effects were evident, in the restoration of order, subordination and good discipline—that there was not a murmur of complaint on the part either of the troops, who were the *neighbors* of "six militia men," or of the culprits themselves—that he conversed with them, and they blamed nobody *but those engaged with them.*

We ask him to read the letter of General *Gaines*, and say whether he does not believe that Gen. HARRISON, Gen. PORTER, the late Major General BROWN, and every other officer in the army, would have acted exactly as *Gen. Jackson* did?—That Gen. *Gaines* would have so acted, is evident. Gen. Gaines' letter is important too, as it shows some of the disastrous consequences of desertion. It shows, that in the first 2 years of the war, the desertions were so numerous, that the armies of the U. S. were seriously weakened by them, and the objects of the Government defeated by them; and, that Gen. HARRISON and Gen. BROWN were compelled to resort to *capital punishments.*

We ask him to read the cases of execution of soldiers by Gen. GREENE, which we publish to-day, and mark how the conduct of JACKSON is borne out by the example of that great and good man—a man, who united with all the bravery and resolution of the soldier, all the meekness of that peculiarly meek sect from which he sprang—the Society of Friends.

There are many other cases than those, which we publish to-day, of the execution of soldiers, which took place under the command of him, who was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," of the great WASHINGTON, of the beloved and amiable LAFAYETTE, and of various other distinguished officers of the Revolution.

Baltimore, 7th April, 1828.

Hon. J. K. POLK, Esq.

Dear Sir,—The untiring and unblushing efforts of the partizans of Messrs. Adams and Clay, to mislead the people on the subject of the execution of the "Six Militia Men," make it the duty of every friend of Gen. Jackson, of truth, of the character of the country, and of the future discipline of the militia, in the event of its being necessary to call them out, to apply to every source for information calculated to place the conduct of Gen. Jackson, upon that occasion, in its proper light. Believing on my conscience, that the conduct of Gen. Jackson in that matter was legal and proper, that the crimes of the "Six Militia Men" merited the punishment which was awarded to them, by the Court Martial, and, that the good of the service demanded their execution as an example; I confess that the course which the Administration prints are pursuing with regard to them, fills me with awful forebodings for the future welfare of the country.

A *Standing army* is repugnant to the feelings

of our people, and hostile to our republican institutions. The *Militia* therefore, must be our reliance for the defence of our liberties. But, what are the militia without *discipline?* And, if mutineers and deserters are, for party purposes, to be represented as *martyrs*, and under every perversion of existing facts, and forgery of others, the sympathies of a virtuous people are to be enlisted in their behalf;—what militia man can be kept in wholesome restraint? If officers are to be held up, as *murderers*, for a faithful discharge of their duties, and a firm but judicious execution of the laws;—what officer will be willing to serve in our armies? These are questions which the sober and reflecting cannot blink,—they must present themselves to the mind of every man whose principles and judgment are not perverted.

Coming from the State of Tennessee, and familiar with all the transactions in the south and west during the late war, I have thought, that you might be able to furnish me yourself, or to put me in the way of being furnished by others, with all the facts and circumstances, with regard to calling out the Tennessee Militia, and the trial and execution of the "Six Militia Men," and have, therefore, taken the liberty of appealing to you. The administration leaders in this State, are making the most desperate efforts to carry it for the Coalition. Perversions the most numerous and monstrous, and forgeries the most foul and daring, are circulated in every corner of the State, in handbills, pamphlets, and newspapers. Falsehoods are asserted with such boldness, and repeated with such pertinacity, that those who are virtuous, and even intelligent, but uninformed, are staggered. At the last election, the strength of the General in this State was diminished by the circulation of an infamous pamphlet of *Jesse Benton's*. He, notwithstanding, had a majority in the State. His strength has increased much since, and in spite of every effort to mislead the people, the Old Soldier will get a large majority of our votes. That majority may still be increased, by the circulation of correct information;—and there is no subject upon which they want it so much as this of the "Six Militia Men." If you can afford me any, I am sure you will, and I need not say, that my best endeavors shall be used, to place that matter in its proper light, to the people of Maryland. Yours truly and respectfully,

D. S. CARR.

WASHINGTON CITY, April 11th 1823.

D. S. Carr, Esq.

I have received your letter of the 7th instant, requesting me to furnish you with "all the facts and circumstances with regard to the calling out of the Tennessee militia; and the trial and execution of the "six militia men." I had supposed it scarcely possible that any candid, intelligent man, could for a moment doubt the correctness of Gen. Jackson's conduct, in relation to this subject, after the exposition which has already been given of it to the public. No man has ever been more misrepresented and slandered by his political adversaries than Gen. Jackson, and upon no subject more than that in relation to the execution of the "six militia men." Coming from the State in which Gen. Jackson resides, being his personal friend, having long known him intimately, and feeling as I do, that he has been unjustly assailed, I cheerfully comply with your request, in giving you a narrative of the facts connected with the services and execution of these unfortunate men, so far as I have been enabled to ascertain them.

On the 11th of January, 1814, the Secretary of War, wrote to the Governor of Tennessee, authorizing him "to supply by militia drafts, or by volunteers, any deficiency which may arise in the militia divisions under the command of Major General Jackson, and *without referring on this head to this Department.* It may be well that your Excellency should consult Gen. Pinckney on such occasions, as he can best judge of the whole number necessary to the attainment of the public objects." Here was a discretionary power given to the Governor of Tennessee, to call out such portion of the Tennessee militia, without waiting for further or specific orders from the Department of War, as he might deem necessary to supply any deficiency of troops under Gen. Jackson's command. This discretion vested in the Governor was unlimited, with the exception of the suggestion, that it might be well for him to consult General Pinckney, who was at that time, the commander in chief of the army, in that section of the Union. From the great distance of the seat of government from the scene of the war in the South, great delays and incalculable injury to the country, must have been the consequence of waiting orders from Washington, in every instance when militia drafts became necessary. On the 31st January, 1814, the Secretary of War, again wrote to the Governor of Tennessee and referred him to his letter of the 11th of the same month. On the 20th of May, 1814, by virtue of the authority vested in him by the Secretary of War, the Governor of Tennessee issued his order to Gen. Jackson; at that time not in the service of the United States; but a Major General of the Militia of Tennessee, in which he says, "*you will without delay, order out one thousand militia infantry of the 2d division for the term of SIX months, unless sooner discharged by order of the President of the United States*, or you may accept a tender of service of the above number of volunteer infantry from the 2d division for the *aforesaid term*, for the purpose of garrisoning the said posts," (the posts in the Creek nation "at your option, *which latitude in relation to calls for men, to act against the Creeks, in furtherance of the views of government, in that behalf is given to me by instructions from the War Department.*" The Governor further ordered that these troops should rendezvous at Fayetteville, in the State of Tennessee, on the 20th of June, 1814, and should thence be marched to the Posts in the Creek nation, so as to arrive between the 1st and 10th of July, "as about that time the term of service of the troops" then in the field, would expire. On the receipt of this order, what was the duty of Gen. Jackson? He was not at that time an officer of the army of the United States. He was a Major General of the militia of Tennessee, and was bound to obey the mandate of his superior officers. The Governor of Tennessee, by the constitution of that State, is the commander in chief of its militia. He

issued his order to Jackson, and distinctly informed him in the order itself, that he was authorized to issue it "by instructions from the War Department." It was no part of Jackson's right or duty, to question that authority. It was sufficient for him to know that it had been issued by his superior officer, and it was his duty to obey. He did obey. On the 24th of May, 1814, Gen. Jackson issued his order to the militia of the division which he commanded, in which he says, "I am commanded by his Excellency, Governor Blount, to call from my division, one thousand men, in the service of the United States, *for the period of SIX months*, unless sooner discharged by order of the President of the United States." Here then, in his order to the militia of his division, he distinctly informed them that they were called out for the term of SIX months. In obedience to these several orders, these troops constituting a thousand in number, were rendezvoused at Fayetteville, Tennessee, on the 20th of June, 1814, and were on that day mustered into the service of the United States, for the term of SIX months They were placed under the immediate command of Col. Pipkin, and marched to the posts in the Creek nation Of these troops, the six who were afterwards tried and executed at Mobile for mutiny and desertion, were a part. It was notorious to the troops themselves, and to the whole country, at the time they were mustered into service, that it was for the term of six months. The fact had been announced to the troops in the general order calling them into service. The government of the United States, at the time they entered the service, and long subsequent to it, so understood it, for they were actually paid for SIX months service. Indeed we have no official evidence that it is not even now so understood. The muster rolls were returned to the Department of War at the time, and show on their face that they were mustered into service for SIX months. The pay rolls show that they were paid for SIX months. In a letter from Governor Blount to the Secretary of War, dated Oct. 19th, 1814, and among the documents from the War Department, he says, in reference to this very detachment, there is in service from this State 1000 men at the posts in the Creek country. They were ordered out for SIX months, and have nearly three months yet to serve. Here the Department of War were distinctly informed that they were in service for the term of SIX months, and that they had nearly three months to serve. I take it for granted, with these incontrovertible facts staring him in the face, the most violent partizan will no longer contend, that the "six militia men" who composed a part of Col. Pipkin's Regiment, were bound to serve only three instead of six months.

There is a fact connected with this part of the subject, which I shall here take the liberty to state. The documents recently communicated to Congress, by the Secretary of War, do not contain two very important documents, to which I have alluded above, in reference to the length of the time of service of this detachment of militia, viz. the order of the Governor of Tennessee to General Jackson of the 20th of May, 1814; and the order of General Jackson to his division of militia of the 24th of May, 1814, each stating that the time of service was to be SIX months. I transmit to you copies of these documents which I have procured, and which I vouch to be correct. Where are these documents? Governor Blount has recently stated on oath, that he transmitted to the Secretary of War, a copy of *his* order of the 20th of May, 1814, shortly after it was issued, and doubtless the other was likewise forwarded to the Department of War. But now neither of them are communicated to Congress. Are they in a *recess* in the Department? I state the fact that they are not among the documents communicated to Congress, and you will judge.

These troops were marched from Fayetteville, Ten. the place of rendezvous, under the immediate command of Col. Pipkin to the posts in the Creek nation. The corps to which the "six militia men" belonged, was stationed at Fort Jackson. Between the 10th and 20th of September, 1814, before the period even of three months, much less six months, had expired, an alarming mutiny, such as was seldom ever witnessed in any army, took place in the camp, of which these "six militia men" were the ringleaders. *Harris*, who seems to have been the principal, several days before the mutiny broke out, carried about a subscription paper through the camp, obtaining the signatures of all who would agree to go home. In defiance of their officers commanding the post, they on the 19th of September, 1814, violently and tumultuously assembled together, to the number of near two hundred, broke open the public stores, took out provisions, demolished the bake house, shot down beeves, and in the face of authority, left the camp on the next morning "at the end of reveille beat;" yelling and firing scattering guns as they departed, proclaiming to all who would, to follow them.

The troops who remained at the post, were subjected to much exposure and fatigue, in consequence of the reduction of their numbers. The consequence was that they were seized with disease and many of them died. Their death may in a great degree be attributed to the abandonment of the post by the mutineers. These mutineers and deserters were subsequently arrested and brought back to the post. Gen. Jackson, then at Mobile, was informed of what had taken place, and was requested by their commanding officer to order a court martial for their trial. On the 21st of November, 1814, the General ordered a court martial, to be convened at Mobile, for their trial, and directed that the prisoners and witnesses should be sent thither; and on the next day, the 22d, he left Mobile for New Orleans, where he anticipated an attack would soon be made by the enemy. This court martial convened at Mobile on the 5th of December, 1814, General Jackson being at New Orleans. It was composed of officers, with the exception of one, of the Tennessee militia—officers from the same section of country with the accused, who doubtless had all the sympathy for them; and extended to them all the lenity which their duty as officers of the court would permit. They had a fair and full trial, according to the rules and articles of war; and the six ringleaders were sentenced by the court martial to receive the punishment of death by shooting.

The proceedings of the court martial were

forwarded to General Jackson then at New Orleans, for his approval. The six ringleaders were not recommended to mercy by the court martial. No palliating circumstance existed in their case, known to him. He knew they had been tried by a court martial composed of their fellow citizens and neighbors at home. The news of peace had not then arrived. The enemy's forces were still in our waters and on our border. When an attack might be made was unknown, and the militia under General Winchester's command at Mobile, were "threatening to mutiny." (See D. Alexander's statement.) General Jackson saw that the salvation of the country was still in jeopardy, if subordination was not preserved in the army. He approved the sentence, and these six unfortunate, though guilty men, were executed. This approval of the sentence of the court martial was made at New Orleans on the 22d of January, 1815. The first intimation which the General had of the news of peace even by rumour, was received on the 18th or 19th of February, 1815, from Mr. Livingston, now a member of Congress, then one of his aid-de-camps, who had been sent to the British fleet to effect an exchange of prisoners, and who on his return, brought information from Admiral Cochrane, that a vessel had arrived, bringing intelligence that peace had been concluded. (See Mr. Livingston's note of this date enclosed.) This, a mere rumour, was received by Gen. Jackson near thirty days after the approval of the sentence of the court martial, and after the execution had taken place. On the 8th of February, 1815, Fort Boyer, at Mobile Point, was attacked by the British forces both by land and sea, and on the 11th, the attack was renewed and the fort surrendered; so that on the 11th of February, 1815, not even the rumour of peace had reached Mobile. Col. G. C. Russell, who commanded on the day the sentence of the court martial was carried into execution, states in a letter of the 29th of July, 1827, that "we had no knowledge of a treaty of peace having been signed at Ghent, till more than a month after the approval of the sentence, and fifteen or twenty days after its execution." The official news of peace did not reach General Jackson until the 13th of March, 1815; and on the 19th of the same month, the British commander received the official intelligence from his government. It was not until after this period that the British forces left their position on that border of the Union.

The effect which the execution of these men produced in the army was most salutary. Not a whisper was afterwards heard of the mutiny which had threatened Gen. Winchester's command. Subordination was restored, and all the troops in the service were willing, and did without a murmur, perform their duty. Mutiny and desertion were no longer heard of in that part of the military service.

I transmit to you the statement of Major Armstrong, lately of the army, now the Marshal of Alabama, a highly respectable gentleman, who was present at the execution, and who states the facts which came within his knowledge.

From this narrative of facts, it is impossible to conceive how censure can attach to General Jackson. At the time he approved the sentence of the six ringleaders, he pardoned all those who had been recommended to mercy by the court martial that tried them. At the time of the execution all acquiesced in its justice. Every officer in the army responded to the importance of the example for the good of the service. At that time the whole country was satisfied. Not a whisper of censure was heard against the commanding General, or any member of the court martial in reference to it. One of these unfortunate men went from the immediate neighborhood in which I reside, and no other sentiment prevailed on the arrival of the news of the crime he had committed, and the punishment he had suffered, than regret that he had committed the crime, and a deep conviction that he had met the fate his conduct merited. That sentiment in relation to all of them, was universal in Tennessee, where they resided at the time, and such it has continued ever since. The people of Tennessee, many of whom had been in the campaigns against the hostile Creeks, knew too well how to appreciate the crimes of mutiny and desertion in an army, to think of censuring either the court martial or the commanding General, for having performed a duty, however unpleasant, yet absolutely necessary for the defence of the country. The people of Tennessee, claim to be as moral and as humane, as those of other sections of the Union, and yet *they*, the neighbors and acquaintances of these six unfortunate men, and the neighbors and acquaintances of General Jackson, have never thought of censuring him for the approval of their sentence.

As well might you censure the judge for pronouncing the sentence of the law on the culprit, fairly condemned by a jury of his country, as well might you censure the Executive of the Union, or of any of the States for withholding from the condemned criminal a pardon, when he had not been recommended to mercy, and when no circumstance in his case could palliate his crime, as censure Jackson in this instance for withholding from these six mutineers, a remission of their punishment. And yet it is as abhorrent to our feelings, to see a man hanged as to see him shot. The one case is as well calculated as the other to enlist the sympathies of our nature: and yet, who ever heard the judge or the Executive charged with the murder of a man, who was hanged under the regular sentence of the law? What has Jackson done in this instance? He has omitted to pardon six mutineers and deserters, the ringleaders of a mutiny, the highest offence known in an army, that left an important post in the enemy's country almost defenceless, a mutiny, the most alarming of any that took place during the war; and yet we now hear him unblushingly charged with *cold-blooded murder*. If it be said that the laws of the United States (under which they were tried and executed) were too sanguinary, and that the punishment was too severe, the answer is—neither Jackson nor the court martial could alter it. It was their duty to execute and not to amend it. I am justified in coming to the conclusion, that his conduct was approved at the time by the Government itself. How does the matter stand? I undertake to state, that the proceedings of this court martial, and the approval of the sentence by the command-

ing General, were at the time, transmitted to the War Department. These identical *long lost, but now found* documents, were returned to the War Department, were received by that Department without objection, and have there remained without objection until recently for political purposes, an attempt is made to mislead the public. It did not occur to Mr. Madison, or to any officer of the Government, that the "six militiamen" had been wrongfully tried and executed, or that they did not deserve their fate. The conduct of General Jackson was not then disapproved. At a subsequent period, when his conduct in the Seminole campaign was arraigned in Congress, when his whole public life was scrutinized, no charge was then made against him for the trial and execution of the "six militiamen." Then when the transaction was fresh in the recollection of the country, it was not heard of. The result of the investigation is well remembered. His conduct was then ably, and I will add justly vindicated by the present chief magistrate; it was approved by the solemn vote of Congress; it was approved by his country, who then remembered with gratitude his sufferings, his privations, and his services.

If there was no other evidence of the utter falsehood of the charge now so industriously circulated by his enemies, for the purpose of exciting public opinion to his prejudice, the fact that it slept and was not heard of for thirteen years after the occurrence took place, is itself conclusive. Why was it that during the Seminole discussion; why was it that during the last presidential canvass it was not heard of? Simply because it was not true; because when the occurrence was fresh in the recollection of the American people, all acquiesced in the correctness of his conduct. His bitterest enemy did not then dream of censuring him. But now he is a prominent candidate for the Presidency. He stands in the way of the present rulers.—His success is inevitable unless he can be broken down by falsehood and slander. This is the true secret. This is the true cause of the virulent abuse we have seen heaped upon him by the partizans of the administration. They have unblushingly charged him with *cold-blooded murder*. They have represented this great benefactor of his country, as worse than a midnight assassin.

I agree with you that the efforts now making to excite the sympathies of the public in behalf of these mutineers and deserters, is well calculated to produce ruinous consequences if the country should ever again be involved in war.

That subordination must exist, and that examples must occasionally be made, to insure safety in our army, all past experience has proved. Many executions took place during the revolutionary war, both under the command of General Washington and Gen. Greene, and yet neither of those distinguished officers have ever been censured by the American people, who knew too well how to appreciate their patriotic and valuable services. For the honor of the country I trust they never will be.—One I will notice that is in point. It occurred under that great and good man, General Washington. In a letter from General Washington to Robert Morris, dated "*Head Quarters, May 17th*, 1782," he gives an account of it in these words: "Minds soored by distresses are easily rankled; as a specimen of it the privates of the Connecticut line, were the other day upon the eve of a general mutiny; the vigilance of the officers discovered it a few hours before they were to parade; *all the ringleaders have been tried and executed*." This letter is published among the public documents of Congress, and its authenticity will not be questioned.* Here then is an instance among many others that might be enumerated) under the immediate command of General Washington, of the ringleaders of mutiny, in an army suffering fatigue and want, and without their promised pay, having been tried and executed; a mutiny too, not actually consummated, but only meditated. The history of the last war is replete with examples of the execution of soldiers for crimes, under every principal commander in the service, and yet at the time all acquiesced in the importance and absolute necessity of the punishment inflicted for the good of the service. Among others, I refer you to the statement of General Gaines in answer to a note addressed to him by Judge White, of the Senate, and myself.

I have omitted to say many things which might have been said in reference to the course pursued by the administration presses, in regard to this idle story of the "six militia men," the suppression for a season of the documents, their subsequent discovery in the War Department, with all which you must be familiar.

In conclusion I have to say, that General Jackson is the same man now, and equally devoted to his country's honor, that he was when he met and conquered the enemies of that country. He lives in retirement on his farm in Tennessee, and I doubt not, that the country which he so nobly defended, will duly appreciate the services of this much injured man, and rescue him from the shafts of malignant envy and wicked calumny that are levelled against him.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully your obedient servant, JAMES K. POLK.

Governor Blount's order to Gen Jackson.

NASHVILLE May 20th, 1814.

SIR: In compliance with the requisition of Major Gen. Thomas Pinckney, that the posts of Fort Williams, Fort Strother Fort Armstrongf Fort Ross, and Forts Old and New Deposite, should be kept up, the doing of which he has confided to you, until the objects of the Government in relation to the war against the hostile Creek Indians shall have been fully effected: and from the probable expiration of the time of service of the troops now occupying those important posts commanded by Colonel Bunch, prior to a final accomplishment of the views of Government in relation to the Creek war, you will, without delay, order out one thousand militia infantry, of the 2d division, for the term of SIX months, unless sooner discharged by order of the President of the United States; or you may accept a tender of service of the above number of volunteer infantry, from the 2d division, for the aforesaid term, for the purpose of garri-

---

* *Senate State papers, 1st session, 16th Congress.*

joining the said posts, at your option: which latitude in relation to calls for men to act against the Creeks, in furtherance of the views of Government in that behalf, is given to me, by instructions from the War Department.

Those troops will be commanded by an officer of the rank of Colonel, and will be required to rendezvous at Fayetteville, on the 20th of June next; thence they will proceed to the above-mentioned posts, under your order, in such number to each as you shall assign.

It is important to the public interests that they should be at those posts between the 1st and 10th of July next, as about that time the term of service of the troops now there, under Colonel Bunch, will expire, and at which posts there is much public property committed to their charge.

You will order the Muster Master to attend, and muster the troops into service.—You will call on the Contractor for provisions, and on the Assistant Deputy Quartermaster, likewise, for supplies in his department.

WILLIE BLOUNT.

To Major General ANDREW JACKSON,
2d Division of Tennessee Militia.

STATE OF TENNESSEE, }
Montgomery County. }

Be it remembered, that Willie Blount, late Governor of Tennessee, this 1st day of March, 1828, personally appeared before Hiram Bobo, Esq. a Justice of the Peace in and for the County of Montgomery, in the State aforesaid, and he being first duly sworn on the Holy Evangelists of Almighty God, deposeth and saith: that the foregoing writing purporting to be a copy of an order from him to Major Gen. Andrew Jackson, dated 20th May, 1814, is a correct and true copy of his original order to Major General Andrew Jackson, of the 20th of May, 1814, on his files: that the foregoing copy is taken by himself, from the file now in his possession, of his official papers of that date: that a copy of said order was by him transmitted, shortly after its date, by mail, to the War Department: that he has reason to believe, and does believe, that the detachment required by said order to be called out, was regularly mustered, agreeably to order, into service, in the month of June, 1814, and that said detachment, to his knowledge, was put under the command of Col Pipkin, of the Tennessee Millitia. And further he saith not.

WILLIE BLOUNT,
Late Governor of Tennessee.

I, Hiram Bobo, Justice of the Peace in the County of Montgomery, State of Tennessee, hereby certify that the foregoing deposition was made and subscribed before me this 1st day of March, 1828. HIRAM BOBO, J. P.

General Jackson's order to his Division 24th of May, 1814.

"*Brave Tennesseeans of the 2d Division.* The Creek war, through the Divine aid of Providence, and the valor of those engaged in the campaign, in which you bore a conspicuous share, has been brought to a happy termination. Good policy requires that the territory conquered should be garrisoned, and possession retained until appropriated by the Government of the United States. In pursuance of this policy, and to relieve the troops now stationed at forts Williams, Strother, and Armstrong, on the Coosa river, as well as Old and New Deposite, I am commanded by his Excellency Governor Blount, to call from my division one thousand men in the service of the United States, for the period of SIX months, unless sooner discharged by order of the President of the United States.

The Brigadier Generals, or officers commanding the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 9th, Brigades of the 2d division will forthwith furnish from their brigades respectively, by *draft* or *voluntary enlistment*, two hundred men, with two captains, two first, two second, and two third lieutenants, and two ensigns, well armed and equipped for active service, to be rendezvoused at Fayetteville, Lincoln county, in the State of Tennessee, on the 20th June next; and then be organized into a regiment, at which place the field officers, and muster-master will be ordered to meet them.

Officers commanding the brigades composing the 2d division of Tennessee militia, are charged with the prompt and due execution of this order.

ANDREW JACKSON, Maj. Gen.
Commanding 2d Division, T. M."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, }
April 11th, 1828. }

DEAR SIR—I desired to be informed at what precise period, the rumour of peace first reached General Jackson at New Orleans in 1815. I have understood that you, on your return from the British fleet to which you had gone to effect an exchange of prisoners, brought the first intelligence which the General received on that subject. If from recollection or any memoranda in your possession you can give me the information, it will be esteemed a favor.

I have the honor to be very respectfully, your obedient servant, JAMES K. POLK.

Hon. EDWARD LIVINGSTON.

MR. LIVINGSTON'S ANSWER.
April 11th, 1828.

DEAR SIR—My recollection of the date at which the English account of the signature of the treaty of Ghent, was brought to New Orleans, carries it to the eighteenth or nineteenth of February, 1815.

I was sent to the British fleet to treat for the exchange of prisoners, about the first of February, and was detained there until the fall of Fort Bowyer; just as I was leaving the Admiral's ship, the Brazen, sloop of war, came in sight, and I remained until she came up. She brought the first news of the treaty, and I arrived with it at N. Orleans on the 18th or 19th.

My recollection of these dates is strengthened by that of a gentleman, now a visiter at this place, who accompanied me on the mission. The account brought by the Brazen was a Gazette, not an official account of the treaty, and I ought perhaps to add, that very soon after receiving this account General Jackson wrote either to General Lambert or to Admiral Cochrane (I think the former) requesting to know whether he considered the account sufficiently authentic, to justify a cessation of hostilities, to which I think no answer was received until after the eighth of March, when advices were received to induce the General to believe, that the treaty had been ratified at Washington, al-

though even then he had received no despatches from the Government announcing that event.

I hope this may be a satisfactory answer to your note of this date,

And am with great respect, your most obedient servant, EDW. LIVINGSTON.

The Hon. Mr. POLK.

WASHINGTON CITY, *11th April*, 1828.

DEAR SIR—I have received your note of this date, requesting me to state all I may know, in relation to the execution of the "six militiamen" at Mobile in 1815.

In answer I have to state that I joined the army at Mobile, in command of a batallion of the 24th Regiment United States infantry, about the 26th of December, 1814 General Jackson being at that time engaged in the defence of New Orleans. The situation of the army at Mobile was most critical. The troops, chiefly militia, suffered much from the scarcity and want of regular supplies of provisions. The enemy, some time after the battle of the 8th of January, made his appearance in the bay, and took possession of Dauphin Island. We expected an attack daily. Subordination in our camp was all important for our safety. We could but take a retrospective view of the desperate mutiny, which had but a short time before taken place at Fort Jackson, and to dread its recurrence in our camp. It was at this awful crisis that Gen. Jackson's order reached us, approving the execution of the "six militia men." The officers conversed freely of the example then about to be made. But one sentiment prevailed All were deeply impressed with the belief that it was of vital importance to the subordination and future safety of the army, and thought the time propitious for the execution. For myself I have always thought the example a most fortunate one, both as regards the discipline of the army, and the safety of the country.

I was looking on when those unfortunate men were executed, conversed with them a few minutes before their execution in company with Col. Gilbert C. Rupelt. They spoke feelingly of their approaching fate, but without blame to any one but those engaged in the mutiny. At the time they were executed, we had no news or expectation of peace. I remained myself in camp until after the news of peace arrived, and never heard a murmur of dissatisfaction. There were present two brigades of Tennessee militia, many of them no doubt neighbors to those men, and yet not one word of complaint was heard, either against the Court Martial that tried them, or the commanding General that approved the sentence. All agreed in its necessity and importance. The effects produced on the army by this example was evident; the strictest subordination prevailed; every officer and soldier did his duty, and we were relieved from any apprehension of a mutiny in our camp.

I am very respectfully,
Your ob't servant,
F. W ARMSTRONG.

To the HON. JAMES K. POLK, Washington.

WASHINGTON CITY, *24th March*, 1828.

DEAR SIR:—Believing that without subordination, an army is inefficient, and dangerous only to its friends, and that, to enforce it, examples are sometimes indispensable, and knowing that you were in the service of the U. States during the late war, we are induced to ask whether you know of any executions, by sentence of courts martial, during the war, either of regulars or militia, and, if so, under what circumstances, and under whose command.

Latterly, much has been said relative to six or seven soldiers executed under sentence of courts martial in that division of the army commanded by Gen. Jackson, for the purpose of exciting, unjustly, the prejudices of his countrymen against him. We are perfectly satisfied that Gen Jackson did nothing more than his duty required, and our object in making this inquiry of you is not to impute censure to any other officer, under whose command executions may have taken place, but to shew, if such be the fact, that others, as well as Gen. Jackson, have been constrained, for the public good, to let the laws have their effect against those convicted of crimes, which, if passed over with impunity, must have rendered the army worse than useless. We will feel obliged by as early an answer as may suit your convenience.

We have the honor to be,
Very respectfully your ob't servants,
HU. L. WHITE,
JAMES K. POLK.

MAJ. GEN. E. P. GAINES.

WASHINGTON CITY, March 26, 1828.

Gentlemen,—In reply to your inquiry whether I know of any executions by sentence of courts martial, either of regulars or militia, and if so, under what circumstances and under whose command; I think it due to the service, as well as to the reputation of my late and present associates in arms, to say, that I have witnessed, during the war in 1813 and 14, from ten to twelve executions, and that every respectable and efficient commander with whom I have had the pleasure to serve, both of the regular army and militia, however much opposed at the commencement of the war to the infliction of capital or ignominious punishment of every kind, was impelled by experience to concur in the opinion, that, without such examples in cases of desertion, mutiny, &c. the country would have continued to suffer a succession of disasters, such as those which marked the character of the greater part of the first two years of the war.

The first execution which I witnessed was near Franklinton, in the State of Ohio, in May or June, 1813, while under the command of Major General Harrison. Three or four deserters were convicted, and one of them shot upon that occasion; the others were pardoned. In the course of the campaign, in the following September, two or three other deserters were executed upon an island, near Put-in-Bay, on Lake Erie.

The next executions witnessed by me were at Sackett's harbour, in February or March, 1814, under the command of Major General Brown. I am under the impression that six or seven deserters were shot at one time, and two at another time, in the latter part of the winter or spring of 1814, at Sackett's harbour. The exact number I may not distinctly recollect, but I think there were seven, eight or nine. I was at the time of the executions, near Put-in Bay, and at the first

mentioned executions at Sackett's harbour, Adjutant General, prepared the orders, after a very full and deliberate consultation with the Major General, and at Sackett's harbour I read the orders to the troops, and the offenders at the place of execution.

These executions were principally, if not exclusively, confined to deserters from the regular army. Much to the credit of the militia, there were comparatively few desertions from this description of force in service with me on the northern frontier. Had there, however, been many cases of desertion among the militia, I feel warranted by the opinions of many respectable officers, such as General Porter, and those under his command, in supposing that examples would have been made of the principal offenders.

I had often in the year 1813, conversed with Major General Harrison, and in 1814, with Gen. Brown, upon the policy and necessity of such punishments, as I did afterwards, in the year 1815, with General Jackson, and I am convinced that there was scarcely a shade of difference of opinion between them on the subject. They each deplored the evil of desertion, as most demoralising and disastrous in its consequences to the character and physical powe[illegible] the army, and fraught with incalculable [illegible]nef to the resources and reputation of the people of the U. States. I am strongly under the impression that each of those general officers have at different times expressed to me the opinion, that they deemed it an act of *mercy* rather than of cruelty, to make examples of hardened offenders, particularly at the commencement or in the progress of an active campaign against the enemy. Inasmuch as the principle of mercy enters into human efforts to preseve from the ravages of war the innocent and helpless women and children, and the faithful citizens and soldiers, who remain at their posts, true to their trust, but who, abandoned by their unworthy associates, become an easy prey to the opposnig foe; inasmuch as it is an act of mercy to protect the innocent when thus situated, and when that protection can be effected only by punishing the deserters, traitors or their brethren in arms, and worse than traitors to their country, it cannot be denied that it is an act of mercy to shoot cowardly deserters.

Previous to the executions at Sackett's harbour, in the year 1814, it was reported and believed that near two thousand men, had deserted from the army in the preceding 18 or 20 months. Now I think it will not be questioned, that with 2000 well instructed men, added to Gen. Brown's division when under my command at Erie in August, 1814, the crippled army under Lieut. General Drummond would have been destroyed, captured or driven from Upper Canada—with 2000 well instructed men at Bladensburgh on the 24th August, 1814, our beautiful capitol would have been preserved; and though last not least, with 2000 well instructed men added to the force under Gen. Jackson at New-Orleans on the 8th January, 1815, the shattered remnant of the British army, seeking the "Beauty and Booty" of that noble city must have been destroyed or captured.

EDMUND P. GAINES.

The Hon. H. L. White, of the Senate, and the Hon. J. K. Polk, of the H. R.

GENERAL GREENE.

A friend has put into our hands, an original letter of that great Captain and most amiable man, Gen. NATHANIEL GREENE, so distinguished in the war of the Revolution. It is a letter written from his camp in South Carolina, dated 22d April 1782, and addressed to his brother officer the gallant Col. *Otho H. Williams.* In this letter Gen. Greene, after having mentioned some symptoms of mutiny, which had shown themselves in one of the lines of his army, says:—

☞"*One of the Sergeants is to be this day HUNG for encouroging it.* Some of that line have been practising upon your line; but I am in hopes without effect. *This fellow that is to be hung* to-day was one of the most forward in the former mutiny. *You know I act with decision. They had better be quiet.* It is true the Troops have great reason to complain; but this disposition in that line, has a deeper root than sufferings. Desertion *has* prevailed with us for a few nights before the face of mutinyappeared, to a very alarming degree. We are now in a position near Dorchester. Head Quarters *is* at Mr. Waring's near where you visited—Colonel Lee a little before you left the camp. The Enemy threatened us *doyly;* and *was* our troops in good temper, altho they *out number* us greatly, I should have little objection to a fight. General Wayne remains at Ebenezer and great desertion prevails with the enemy there, and *considerably* here. a few days ago twenty four refugees *come* off together. Capt Neal fell in with the *enemies* horse a little below Dorchester yesterday and got the *rubers.* He lost seven or Eight men and Eight or ten horses. He killed the Negro General known by the name of *March.*—

"I am told Congress have again changed the plan of promotion. If so, I fear you will meet with difficulty in obtaining yours. *How ever* you must learn patience, justice moves *slow.*"

"Believe me to be yours affectionately

N. GREENE."

This letter shows that examples by military execution have been made by other great men beside General Andrew Jackson. It shows too, that other great men have been guilty of errors, in *orthography* and *syntax* as well as General Jackson.

It is painful to be presenting a man whose memory is embalmed in our affections, in the light of a bad speller and incorrect grammarian and we do it, not in disparagement of General *Greene,* but in defence of General *Jackson.* We doubt not, that the errors of both, are to be attributed to haste and inattention; and not to ignorance. General Greene was the favorite of WASHINGTON, and prized next to him, by the old Congress and the people He was a man of a high order of intellect and of the purest character. Yet he *hung mutineers,* and committed errors in *syntax* and *orthography.* The fact is both General Greene and General Jackson were men of *actions* and not of *words.* They were fighting the battles of their country, and if they could not describe them with as much *grafic* beauty and as "strict a regard to rhetorical propriety" as Mr. Adams, they could tell, intelligibly, what they had *done.* Can Mr. Adams tell what *he* has done? Is his famous letter to LEVIT HARRIS relieved at all, of its

mean and cowardly spirit, by the goodness of its *grammar*, or the correctness of its *spelling!*
Editor of Baltimore Republican.

EXECUTION OF A MILITIA MAN.

In Gordon's "History of the rise, progress, and establishment of the Independence of the United States," page 28 of the 4th vol. we find the following account of the execution of a soldier under the command of Gener l GREENE. It was after Gate's defeat and shortly after General Greene arrived at Head Quarters and assumed the command of the southern army.

"On his arrival in camp, he learned that the troops had made a practice of going home without permission, staying weeks, and then returning. Determined to stop such a dangerous custom, the General gave out, that he would make an example of the first deserter of the kind he caught; and one was accordingly shot at the head of the army, drawn up to be spectators of the punishment. At night he sent officers round the camp, to listen to the talk of the soldiers, and was happy to find that the measure had taken its desired effect, and that the language of the men was only—"We must not do as we have been used to, it is new lords, new laws."

Now, this was the case of a soldier's doing what they had all been in the habit of doing—his home being in the neighborhood of a camp he had gone there without leave. He had not gone off with the intention of remaining altogether—meant to return. But an example was necessary for the good of the service and the safety of the country, and General Greene, whose humanity no one ever questioned or dare question, did not hesitate to have him *executed* Contrast this case with that of the "*six militiamen,*" and tell us, if *Jackson* was a *murderer*, what was *Greene?*

INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT.

Remarks of Mr. McLANE, on the bill making appropriations for Internal Improvements; the amendment limiting the sum appropriated for surveys ($30,000) to those objects already commenced.

Mr. McLANE said, he regretted the necessity he felt to take any part in the present discussion. His own impression corresponded with that of the Senator from Maine, (Mr. PARRIS,) that the amendment recommended by the Committee of Finance, had received the unanimous concurrence of the members of that Committee, and especially embracing the views of the honorable Chairman. Mr. McL., himself, approved the recommendation, though it had been his wish to submit it to the judgment of the Senate, without particular explanation from him. But the course the subject had taken, seemed to impose upon him the duty, from which he would not shrink, of stating the grounds which had led him to assent in Committee, to the amendment now under consideration,

Mr. McL. said, he did not concur with the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. WEBSTER,) that this question might be discussed with more propriety upon a direct proposition to repeal the act of 1824, authorizing the surveys. Such a proposition would have no similarity to the question now before the Senate. The amendment reported by the Committee of Finance, does not propose, nor would that Committee recommend the repeal of the act of 1824, and he was unwilling to suffer such an erroneous impression to be made by any remark in this debate. It was incapable of accomplishing by indirection, that, which it might be injudicious to attempt by direct means The views of the Committee of Finance, were in strict conformity, not only with the spirit and policy of the law of 1824, but with its plain liberal import. So far from conflicting with the objects of that law, the amendment proposed more effectually to accomplish them; to recommend them to the favorable consideration of the country, and by preventing a wider departure from the provisions of the act, to ensure it a salutary operation.

Mr McL. said, he had been an advocate of the act of 1824, was a member of the House of Representatives, when it was reported and discussed, and bore his full share, an humble one he admitted, in promoting its passage, when some of those, now the professed advocates of this system were in the ranks of its opponents. He had never doubted the expediency or constitutionality of the law of 1824, and if his opinion had undergone any change, it was only in regard to the purposes to which, as he apprehended, the act had been unwisely perverted. He yet stood upon his original ground, while others have taken a new position, which he could not occupy. He well remembered the discussion to which the act of 1824 gave rise, enlisting the best talents of both sides of the House; the able constitutional views which were then presented; and that the measure was mainly recommended to the sanction of Congress by its exclusive relation to such objects only as avoiding the local concerns of the States, & were clearly comprehended within the several grants of power committed by the Constitution to the government of the Union. Recognizing the right and expediency of the General Government to lend its aid to objects of internal improvement exclusively confined to the sphere of its own action, the law directed surveys to ascertain the practicability of such objects and his aim now was to confine the execution of the law within that limit

The provisions of this law, he said, sufficiently bespoke its scope and object. It enacts "that the President of the United States is hereby authorized to cause the necessary surveys, plans and estimates, to be made of the routes of such roads and canals, as he may deem of national importance in a commercial or military point of view, or necessary for the transportation of the public mail; designating, in the case of each canal, what parts may be made capable of sloop navigation; the surveys, plans and estimates for each, when completed, to be laid before Congress."

Thus the law itself distinguishes between objects of a mere local character, and those of general concern, by confining the surveys to the routes of "*national importance,*" as connected with the *commercial* and *military* powers of the general government, and the transportation of the mail. He was not now, nor ever

had been, of those who believed there was no limit to the authority of the General Government over this subject. He thought, on the contrary, it was confined to the attainment of the specified grants in the Constitution, and could not concern itself with objects local to the States, without infringing their rights, and by disturbing the nice adjustment of power, endanger its own security.

He denied that a road or canal from one part to the other of the same State, which might indirectly promote the commerce between the States, or be occasionally used by the United States for the passage of troops, or the transportation of munitions of war, or of the mail, would for that reason fall within the power of the General Government. Such a doctrine would leave this Government without limit, and give it the right of constructing all the county roads, and interior canals in the country. All improvements of this kind, however local in their character, might occasionally subserve the purposes of the government, as of individuals; and all the works in each township of the Union, have some remote bearing upon commercial enterprize, and pay their tribute, however humble, to the common mass of improvement. But a work to fall within the scope of the Constitution, or the law of 1824, must have an immediate and necessary relation to the express grants of power. Beyond this he had never gone, and could not now go. He understood the act of 1824 as confined to this limit, and extending to those objects only, to which, after the surveys should be completed, the General Government might apply its resources, as necessary to the great purposes of its administration. For this reason the act required *estimates* to be made and submitted to Congress, which could not have been required of works of a mere local character exclusively within the power of the States, and beyond the pale of the Constitution.

Nor could the design of ordering these surveys and plans have been, as had been suggested, merely to obtain accurate topographical knowledge of the country, to be locked up in the archives of the Department for occasional inspection, or as memorials of our Military science. That could have been effected without the law of 1824, and in the ordinary discharge of the duties appertaining to the Military administration. The act in question had a more precise and practical end; to ascertain the practicability in regard both to position and expense, of those works which were necessary to the sound action of the general government, but could not be accomplished by the States.

Such he contended was the true and obvious import of the law of 1824; illustrated and confirmed by the interpretation given to it at that day by the Executive, to whom its execution had been confided, and by the proper officer duly communicated to Congress.

It would be observed, he said, that the act had passed on the 30th April, 1824, directing the President to designate and survey works of a certain character, and report the result to Congress. The practical discharge of these duties being regularly referred to the Department of War, the law was subjected to a close scrutiny, and received a final, and as he thought, a satisfactory interpretation. As early as December, 1824, the President of the U. States, in his message to Congress, at the commencement of the session, communicated the able report of the then Secretary of War, Mr. CALHOUN, in which the views of the Executive, and the principles by which it was intended to execute the act were fully and clearly defined. To such parts of that report as more immediately related to this subject, he asked leave to invite the attention of the Senate.

[Here Mr. McLANE read from Mr. CALHOUN'S Report of the 3d December, 1824, as follows.]

"It been ne necessary in giving orders to the board under the act, to determine what routes for roads and canals were of "national importance" in the view contemplated by the act, as such only as the President might deem to be of that description were authorised to be examined and surveyed. In deciding this point, it became necessary to advert to our political system in its distribution of powers and duties between the General and State Governments. In thus regarding our system, it was conceived that all of those routes of roads and canals which might be fairly considered as falling within the province of any particular State, however useful they might be, in a commercial or political view, or, to the transportation of the mail, were excluded from the provisions of the act. The States have important duties to perform in facilitating by means of roads & canals, political and commercial intercourse among their citizens; & within the spheres of these duties, they are more competent to act than the general government; and there can be no rational doubt, but that, as the population and capital of the several States increase, these powerful means of developing their resources, will receive from their respective legislatures due attention. But, as numerous as this class of improvements is, and as important as it may be to the general government in the discharge of the various duties confided by the Constitution to it, there are other improvements not comprehended in it, of a more general character, which are more essentially connected with the performance of its duties, while they are less immediately connected with those belonging to the State governments, and less within their power of execution. *It is believed that this class, and this only, was comprehended in the provisions of the act.* In projecting the surveys in this view of the subject, the whole Union must be considered as one, and the attention directed not to those roads and canals which may facilitate intercourse between different parts of the same State, but to those which may bind all of the parts together, and the whole with the centre, thereby facilitating commerce and intercourse among the States, and enabling the government to disseminate promptly, through the mail, information to every part, and to extend protection to the whole. By extending those principles, the line of communication by roads and canals through the States, the general government, instead of interfering with the State governments within their proper spheres of action, will afford, (particularly to those States situated in the interior,) the only means of perfecting improvements of similar description, which properly belong to them."

In conformity with these principles, the various routes which the President deemed it his

duty to cause to be surveyed, are particularly designated and explained; and the report concludes with stating that, "When the various routes to which it referred and explained are examined and surveyed, and plans and estimates formed in conformity with the directions of the act, it will present as full a view of the whole subject, as will enable Congress to commence and complete such a system of internal improvement, as it may deem proper with the greatest possible advantage."

Mr. M'L said he entirely concurred in the principles laid down in this report, and could not be induced to transcend them. He would not say that there might not be other objects of "national importance," than those designated; nor did he deem it necessary to insist, though he thought it might be contended with great propriety, that the act would be fully executed with the accomplishment of these objects. But it appeared to him that, the annual appropriation for this purpose, since 1824, must have been primarily applicable to these objects until the surveys were completed, and the estimates submitted to Congress, that they might be enabled to judge of the expediency of going on with the works, or of directing new and further examinations. This seemed to him to be the main design of the report itself, dictated no less by the propriety of the subject, than the obvious intention of the law.

He asked if all this had been done? He would not say it had not, but he had received no information to satisfy him that any of these surveys had been completed according to the terms of the act of 1824, while it was apparent that there had been a wide deviation from the luminous chart marked out by the report to which he had adverted. If any of these *surveys* had been completed, it was, nevertheless, certain that the plans and *estimates* had not all been submitted to Congress, and that down to the present period, no opportunity had been afforded us of determining upon the propriety of the system contemplated by the act, and projected in the report, in pursuance of it.

Why, he inquired, had this not been done? Because a more enlarged construction had been given to the act of 1824, and the labors of the Engineer Corps had been directed to surveys of routes not only beyond the report, but of a mere *local character*, in which it could scarcely be pretended the General Government could rightfully interfere. The subsequent appropriations had been considered as authorizing the surveying of new objects, and as warranting the employment of the corps in the service of the several States, of corporations, or of individuals, on more local objects; in some instances as he believed, authorizing speculative examinations of routes for roads or canals, where there could be little probability that any practical work would be prosecuted, by any authority whatsoever. Now the object of the amendment, proposed by the Committee of Finance, said Mr. McL., was to apply a remedy to what he deemed an evil, and to stop useless and improper surveys; to bring the Executive back to the original and true objects of the law, that the surveys and extremities of the routes contemplated by the act, might be submitted to Congress, and thus afford an opportunity of inquiring into the propriety of undertaking the works, or of extending the number. He was unwilling to submit longer to the practice of perpetually exploring and surveying, without the hope of practically accomplishing the works. He desired to be understood, as not imputing the fault, which he had adverted, to the Executive, whom he knew, was not alone responsible. He was aware, that it was usual to order these surveys, upon the application of the delegation in Congress, of the particular State or States, in which a work may be projected, and that such applications could not be easily put by. The Senator from Louisiana, had complained that the small States had been neglected in this distribution of favors; if the complaint was well founded, it might be proper to consider, whether the mode of thus procuring the interference of the Government, was not itself the cause of that neglect. Certain it was, he said, that these solicitations were not always successful, because they related to works of national importance, "justifying the interposition of the Government, but not unfrequently on account of the weight of official station and character, and it might be, in some instances, of numerical force. It was this practice, which led to the surveys of local routes, not within the competency of the General Government, which created delusive expectations throughout the country, never to be realized, and which might be perverted to political purposes, not only foreign from the law, but injurious to the service, and destructive, ultimately, of the system itself.

He said, he could not assent to the argument of the Senator from Louisiana, that a survey could be necessary to test or ascertain the *national character* of any of these works. That question, he said, depended upon a sound interpretation of the Constitution, to which a survey of the route could throw no light. It was not to be decided so much by a minute knowledge of the topography of the country, as by reference to our political system in its distribution of powers and duties between the General and State Governments. These surveys were to test the practicability of a work: they had nothing to do with the constitutionality of our interference; that, we should decide for ourselves before we incur the expense of the survey, and he was unwilling to employ the Engineer corps throughout the year, exploring all parts of the Union, in search of objects, which might or might not be fit for our legislative action.

Mr. McLANE said, he did not feel the force of the apprehension which had been expressed, of injury to works of acknowledged utility, by limiting the appropriation. He felt quite sure, that no useful work would be neglected, or retarded, by this amendment. It would be recollected that the operations of the government in respect to the great class of improvement, were wholly independent of the appropriation for surveys. Of this character, were the numerous other items in the bill now before the Senate, all of which would receive his cordial support. The examinations of our coast and rivers, clearing out and deepening the waters and channels, and the extensive class of harbor improvement in all parts of the Union, whether in progress or to be commenced, are provided for, by separate appropriations. Some applications for these objects have already been com-

sidered, and bills have passed the Senate; others are yet before the appropriate Committees, and will doubtless be provided for, whenever it may be expedient to do so. It is thus that upon objects of acknowledged propriety and necessity, Congress is constantly called upon to act: and while acting with a wise liberality, upon these objects within our constitutional sphere, there could be no propriety in leaving the annual appropriation for surveys to the irresponsible discretion of the War Department, at least before he can be informed of the actual character of the works on which he must hereafter act

Mr McLANE said he concurred in the remark that, the task of distinguishing the works within the power of the general government was one of moral difficulty; and that was a reason in his opinion, why the discrimination should be made by Congress, acting under their constitutional obligation. It was one motive with him for desiring to limit the action of the Executive as now exercised, and to enlarge that of Congress in the manner proposed by the amendment.

But although there might be difficulty in distinguishing, in some cases, the works falling within the power of the general government, it was easy in many to distinguish those beyond our power, and in no case was the difficulty insuperable. The able report of the Secretary of War, Mr. Calhoun, to which he had had occasion so often to advert, had drawn the distinction, so far as it went, with much accuracy and precision. If his own opinion could be supposed entitled to weight in this respect, he might admit that the contemplated post roads through the Atlantic States, and the rail road from Baltimore to Wheeling, which had been mentioned, fell within the distinction, but he denied that a rail road from one part to another within the State of Maryland, fell within the class of works entitled to the aid of the general government

Mr. M'L. said, he could not admit that Congress were less fit or competent than the other departments of the government to deal with this subject. On the contrary, they were most fit from the peculiar composition of the two Houses, and it was more over their appropriate duty by the constitution. The act of 1824, referred the ultimate decision of the whole subject to Congress, and the amendment is in furtherance of that end. If the system of surveys, or of internal improvement itself, be of such a character as to defy the interposition of Congress, it would be in his opinion too dangerous to be attempted; and when convinced of this, he would be prepared to abandon it altogether. He here repeated that the mass of the surveys which had been making under color of the law of 1824 had not even been considered by Congress, much less had they received its sanction.

Mr M'LANE said he denied the power of the general government to survey the routes of works which they could not constitutionally promote: and therefore he contended, that the expenditure for all surveys of local objects had been unconstitutional, and not authorized by the act of 1824. The right to survey the route of a road or canal, was auxiliary only to the right of constructing the work according to the survey, and this government, could not be warranted in entering the territory of a state, and expending the public money in a topographical reconnoisance of works exclusively within the power of the State.

Having no power ourselves to accomplish such works, he deemed it inexpedient to permit the annual expenditure of large sums of the public money by the Executive, for similar objects

Gentlemen had said that the surveys of local objects were not so numerous as had been supposed, and that most of them might be shewn to be within the power of the general Government.

Easily as he supposed this opinion might be refuted, Mr. McLANE said he would not now be drawn into a discussion of the character of the numerous routes, mentioned in the list before the Senate. It might be invidious too, for him to distinguish in this list, those particular routes which had been improperly attended to. He begged leave, however, to call the attention of the Senate to the *Rutland canal*, which appears by the report of the Engineers to be exclusively for local objects; and also, to most of the surveys in the States of Maine and New Hampshire, which he believed, the Senators from those states would not pretend were in any respect of national importance He did not think the propriety of the amendment, depended entirely upon the extent to which the practice of which he had been speaking, had been carried. It was enough that it was recognized by the Executive as proper to be continued; that the act of Congress as explained by the report of 1824 had been transcended, and that no official exposition had been made, either of the grounds of this practice, or of the result of the original objects of the law. It was enough, at least, to justify us in limiting the application of the money until such exposition could be furnished.

It might be true, he said, as had been suggested, that the amendment might not meet the whole evil, as a part of the appropriation might be expended on those works of a local character already in progress. But he thought this apprehension would depend very much upon those charged with the application of the money: and the amendment proposed the only remedy of which the case was susceptible, that of stopping the surveys altogether, which he wished to avoid. The Engineers being already in the field, and having incurred expense, could not be withdrawn without material loss and injury to the service; and as the sum granted in the bill is less by $20,000, than that demanded by the estimates it is not improbable that most of it may be required for those objects properly authorized. If the amendment prevail, it may be fairly presumed that the Executive conforming himself to the expressed views of Congress, will so apply the money as to effectuate those views, and avoid the inconvenience now suggested. At all events, the alternative was between a partial remedy, and an encouragement of the mischief: for if the appropriation be left unlimited, the Department will be at liberty, if it be not limited by the rejection of the amendment, to persevere in the present practice, and by originating new surveys, not only augment the evil, but finally provoke an absolute repeal of the law of 1824. He believed this danger

more imminent when he reflected upon the progressive character of the evil, and the excusable pertinacity with which one State would press its claims to indulgence which it had seen extended to others.

He could not doubt, that the amendment would relieve the Department itself of much of the importunity to which it was at present exposed. For, as he understood the present practice, to be controlled only by Congress, the Corps of Engineers may not be unfrequently employed in the service of a State, or private Corporation, in making surveys, plans and estimates of local projects, and with the public money appropriated for the purposes of the law of 1824. He did not object to their being thus employed because the work was undertaken by a State or Corporation; for he had ever entertained the opinion, that the resources of the Government could be best applied to these works, in aid of individual enterprize; but his objection applied to the character of the work, and the employment of the public money, for objects which the Constitution forbade us to touch.

Nor was he disposed, he said, as had been intimated by the Senator from Louisiana, to withhold the science of the Government from the service of a State, even for local objects, when the public service would admit of such employment. The Corps of Engineers, formed a part of the military organization of the country, and were maintained by the general appropriation for the military service. It was competent for the Executive, by keeping them in constant practice and employment, to preserve and invigorate the science, as well as the physical energies of all parts of the army, to keep its armour bright in peace, that it might be efficient on the first occurrence of war. As it employed the rank and file of the army on the roads, he saw no objection to the employment of its scientific men on the application of a State, requiring only that the State should pay the extra expense. He had always understood this to have been the usage under the former administration of the War Department, and he did not desire to change it. He repeated, that it was not to such employment of the military science, but to the expenditure of the public money, on objects local to a State, and to the detriment of the public service, that his objection was directed.

Mr. McL. said, he would not pursue these topics further. He felt that the whole system of internal improvement, was beset with serious difficulties, and he believed the greatest danger to which it stood exposed, was that of being prematurely pushed so far, as to produce reaction, and array the public sentiment against it. The objects legitimately within the sphere of the General Government, were, he believed, free and of that acknowledged importance, as would, if wisely pursued, be sustained by a large portion of the people. But when the Government neglected these, and intermeddled with local concerns, a countervailing spirit would arise, tending to abridge its just action.

Constituted as this government is, said he, it is impossible for us, in the execution of our various powers and duties, to disregard the opinions and feelings of a large portion of the Union. Public opinion must be dealt with by reason and argument, and in most instances the right to exercise any particular power should be demonstrated before it is exerted. An attempt to force our operations for internal improvements, by a profuse and indiscriminate expenditure of the public money must act eventually against the system itself. He thought the present state of public feeling in many parts of the Union justified these remarks. The cause of internal improvement had been gradually winning its way to the favor of the people for more than thirty years, and the law of 1824 placed it on safe ground, if that position had been judiciously maintained. But it had been carried much beyond that, and no statesman could cast his eye over the country at the present day, without perceiving that new and more formidable dangers were gathering before it. Why, he asked, was this? It was, as he believed, because the system had been pushed too far—farther than its most sagacious friends had ever contemplated. The Executive had taken part, not only in advance, but so far in advance of public opinion, and on ground so untenable in the judgment of the most enlightened advocates of the federal government, as, to create an apprehension that its powers are without limit, and as extensive as was ever predicted of its wildest assumptions. In advocating the amendment reported by the Committee, his design was to re-occupy the ground he had left, and by acknowledging a reasonable limit to the powers of this government, save it from the reproof of its own extravagance.

For himself, he was not anxious to make professions here of his constitutional opinions. He was content to refer to his past votes, to those he had given at the present session, and to those it might be his duty to give hereafter. He was satisfied in the belief that they were right now, and the humble hope that they would abide the test of time. He was the advocate of the system of internal improvement for its own merits, and their intimate connection with the public weal. He would not consent to use it as auxiliary to any other cause or purpose whatever, than its own great ends. He professed to be no further the friend of any measure than he faithfully labored to accomplish its real objects. His aim was to keep himself on the line of the Constitution, avoiding the extremes of either side; and looking to a wise and judicious exercise of the reasonable powers of the general government as essential to its own existence and the safety of the Union, he would not consent to do too much, to escape the suspicion of not doing enough.

On motion of Mr. BENTON, the bill was then laid on the table.

On announcing the vote of the Senate, on the amendment made in Committee of the Whole, to the Internal Improvement Bill, limiting the appropriation of 1828, for the surveys, to the completion of those already commenced, the VICE PRESIDENT made the following remarks:

He said, he solicited the indulgence of the Senate, while he made a few remarks, which he hoped would be granted, as a reference had been made in the debate, to his course both on this and former occasions, in relation to the subject of internal improvement. It was

declared by one of the Senators from Ind. (Mr. Hendricks,) that the vote in committee on the amendment, just concurred in by the Senate, was tantamount to an abandonment of the system, and that it could only be defended on that ground The Chair gave the casting vote in favor of the amendment in Committee, and if the assertion of the Senator be correct, he, who fills it, would, in a special manner, be liable to the charge of inconsistency, attempted to be fixed on that portion of the friends of internal improvement who supported the amendment. It was his wish, in every public act, to be distinctly understood. The object of his vote was, not to abandon his former principles It was in strict conformity to them. Had he voted otherwise, he might then indeed have been charged with inconsistency.

From the beginning, he had seen that the system was exposed to great danger from its liability to abuse; to guard against which, required much prudence and firmness. Its tendency to degenerate from objects truly national, such as were connected with the powers and duties of the general government, to those merely local, and also to become the means of extensive and dangerous political combinations, could not be doubted If experience should prove, which he hoped it would not, that this tendency was too strong to be resisted, it ought and would prove fatal to the system, for as high as the people might estimate the benefits of internal improvement, they still more highly value, as they ought, the purity of our political institutions. He did not intend to intimate, that abuses had occurred. His object was simply to state, what his opinion is, and always had been, in order that his conduct, which had been in exact conformity to it, might be fully understood. It was the fortune of him, who now fills the Chair, to discharge the duties of Secretary of War, when the act of 1824, which authorises the surveys, passed, and acting on the views, which he has stated, his first step was to submit to the President a report containing his opinion of the construction, which, after mature deliberation, he thought ought to be given to it, with a plan in detail, for carrying it into effect, enumerating the roads and canals supposed to be comprehended in the provisions of the act, which report was submitted by the President to Congress, at the present session. In pursuing this course, it was his intention to place the whole subject, in all of its aspects, before the Legislative branch of the government, and thereby to bring the entire control of the system under its immediate supervision. He then, as now, thought the power too great to be placed at the discretion of any officer of the government; nor in his opinion, ought any individual to desire to be placed in a situation so exposed to importunities and influence, as he must necessarily be in the exercise of power so high and unlimited. Congress was the only safe depository of such power; and as he considered the amendment, but as a step towards giving to it the entire control over the subject, he could not consistently with his habitual mode of thinking and acting, reject it by his vote.— He trusted it would be followed up till a system of specific appropriations was introduced into this, as well as all other branches of disbursements. In none could it be more important, than that under consideration, which from its nature, was so liable to abuse. There, if the common funds be unequally applied, as it probably would, if not immediately controlled by Congress, it must create discontent in the portions of the country neglected. It ought never to be forgotten, that it was only through specific appropriations, that the Legislative branch of the government could maintain its proper ascendency in our political system, and thereby restrain within safe limits the influence of the Executive Department, already so greatly and dangerously extended. With him, this opinion was not recently adopted. He so thought in 1817, while a member of the other House. He then moved a resolution to inquire into the expediency of repealing the act, which vested in the President the power to transfer at his pleasure, appropriations from one head of disbursements to another, a power, which virtually abolished the whole system of specific appropriations. He met with great resistance, and succeeded partially only; but what he then did laid the foundation of almost wholly divesting the executive, at a future session, of so dangerous a power.

He would, with the indulgence of the Senate, avail himself of this opportunity of explaining briefly the vote which he gave two sessions since, on the Illinois canal bill, and which had been alluded to in the debate. His motive in giving the casting vote against that measure, had been greatly misrepresented. It was given, not from objection to the projected canal, as had been misstated, but from objections to some of the provisions of the bill. He had recommended the canal in the report, which he made in 1819, under the resolution of the House of Representatives, as highly important which opinion remains unchanged. It would be the great channel of commerce and intercourse between the Missouri and Mississippi rivers, and the upper Lakes; but notwithstanding his high estimate of its importance to so large a portion of our country, he could not reconcile it to his sense of duty to vote for the bill His objections to a part of its provisions were insuperable. He did not object to the appropriation which it proposed to make of the public lands through which the route of the projected canal was laid down. On the contrary, he thought they constituted the natural fund, and ought to be applied to defray the expense of constructing the canal. Nor did he believe, that a constitutional objection could be fairly raised to such an application of a portion of the public lands. In Congress was vested the power of disposing of those lands, and it did appear to him almost impossible to raise a constitutional objection to such a disposition of a portion of them, as would make the residue more valuable, than the whole, without such improvement, which would be the fact, as was conceded in the instance under consideration. In such cases the General Government acted in the new States not so much as a sovereign, as a great land proprietor, who was bound to contribute to such improvements, as would enhance the value of landed estates, by improving the means of intercourse. But while he assented to the proposed donation of land to construct the projected canal, there was another provision to which he could not be reconciled, and which compelled him to vote against it

instead of making the canal toll free to all of the citizens of the United States, the bill proposed to give to the State of Illinois the right of levying a toll for her own use, not only on her own citizens, but on all others who might use it, excepting only the United States when transporting their troops and public stores. He did not think such a provision could be reconciled either with principle, or policy. The public lands belong to all the people of the Union, and Congress was but the trustee, holding them for their common benefit, and could not, in his opinion, consistently with the nature of its trust, apply a portion of the common fund to the construction of an important work of the kind, to be, when completed, not the property of the whole, but that of a single state, constituting a small portion of the whole people of the Union. It was competent for the State of Illinois to cut the canal at her own expense, but surely, if, she should ask the people of the Union to do it for her, out of a common fund, she ought not to object to its being free to the citizens of the other States particularly those as much interested in the use of the work as herself? This was substantially true of all of the States lying on the Mississippi, but more strictly so, of the State of Missouri. It would not in fact be too much to assert, that she would be more interested in the canal, than Illinois herself, as great as was her interest. A large portion of the latter State would never use it in their intercourse with the lakes, but it would be the only channel that would be used by all of the people of Missouri, in their intercourse with the inland seas, whose commerce in time must be so great. Thus thinking, he could not reconcile it to his conception of duty, regarding the interest of all, to give his vote in its favor, containing as it did the provision under consideration. But he deemed it his duty at the time to apprise the Senators from Illinois of his objection. He anticipated the vote would be close, and that the passage of the bill might depend on the decision of the Chair. He informed them, that he approved of the object of the bill, and that he was desirous of recording his vote in its favor, should the Senate be equally divided, as was not improbable; but with the provisions in it, to which he objected, he could not give it his sanction, and requested them, if agreeable to their conception of what was proper, to amend the bill, in such a manner, that he might vote for it, should its passage depend on the Chair.

On examining the resolution of the State of Illinois, under which they acted, they did not feel at liberty to propose an amendment of the kind, and the Chair was accordingly compelled, by an equal division of the Senate, to vote as it did.

Mr. C. said he had nothing to disguise. He had never concealed a political sentiment, and would hold himself in contempt were he capable of so cowardly a course.

He concluded by asking pardon of the Senate, for occupying any portion of its time, but expressed a hope that they would find a justification in the situation in which he was placed, by the reference which had been made to his course, on this subject, in the debate.

THE WEBSTER BARGAIN.

It will be recollected that it has been charged that Mr. Webster held a letter, which he and other federalists considered as a pledge, on the part of Mr. Adams, to bestow offices on the federal party. It has also been said, that this letter contained certain alterations, or corrections, made in the handwriting of Mr. Adams himself. During the last summer, the Editor of the National Palladium, charged that this letter was obtained through the agency of Mr. John Bailey, who is known as the confidential clerk of Mr. Adams.

This statement was made a short time before the New York Elections; and Mr. Adams, then on his way from Boston, authorized Mr. Charles King, the Editor of the New York American, to contradict the statement in the Palladium. Whether to the extent afterwards stated by Mr. King, which we understand to have been an unequivocal denial in all its parts, is uncertain. The denial of the American was followed up by a certificate of Mr. Bailey.

In reply to this statement of Mr. Bailey, and the denial in the American, it was stated that the Editor of the Palladium was in error, in supposing that Mr. Bailey had any agency in obtaining the letter; that it was obtained by Mr. Webster in person; that Mr. W. had spoken of the letter to several gentlemen; and Mr. McLane, of Delaware, Mr. Hopkinson and Mr. Walsh, of Philadelphia, Mr. Warfield, of Maryland, Mr. Stockton, of New Jersey, and Mr. Van Rensselaer, of New York, have been named as of that number. The Editor of the New York Evening Post, and the Editors of the Richmond Enquirer, have spoken in the most unequivocal terms of the existence of the letter; and Mr. Webster has been challenged to deny the fact. The Post has said that, one of the most highly respectable men, told the Editor that Mr. Webster, putting his hand upon his pocket and speaking of the pledge, said, "I have it, here, in black and white." Yet Mr. Webster, and all the other gentlemen named, have remained silent.

A Mr. Wood, who, it seems, has resided in New Jersey, and has lately become the Editor of a paper in Buffaloe New York, has published what he charges to be an extract from a letter written by Mr. Stockton, who is since dead, in which it is charged that Mr. Webster exhibited the letter to him, in the presence of Mr. Hopkinson, at Bispham's, Trenton, N. J.

An Extract from this statement was republished in the New York Evening Post, in reply to which, the following note, addressed to the editor, by the son of Mr. Stockton, has been published:

(COPY.)

PRINCETON, April 18th, 1823.

To the Editor of the N. Y. Evening Post.

SIR—In your paper of the 16th, there is an extract, from the "Buffalo Republican," containing what is stated to be "an extract of a letter from Mr. Stockton, of Princeton." I take the liberty to inform you that I believe my father never wrote such a letter, and that the extract in question must be an entire fabrication. It is perhaps unnecessary for me to say any thing more on that subject at present.

I am, your ob't and humble serv't,

R. F. STOCKTON

The National Gazette says,

"In addition to the reasons already given to shew that the letter alleged to have been written by Mr. Stockton is a mere fabrication, *we have authority for saying, that all that part of it, which details an interview between Mr. Stockton and Mr Hopkinson, at Bispham's, in Trenton, at which a certain letter was shewn, has not the least shadow of foundation in truth. No such interview ever took place—no such letter was ever shewn to Mr. Stockton in the presence of Mr. Hopkinson; or, to his knowledge, at any other time or place.*"

These statements are now seized upon by the administration papers, as proofs of what? of the innocence of Mr. Adams!! These statements do not deny the existence of the letter, charged to have been in the possession of Mr. Webster. They only deny the authenticity of the letter said to have been written by Mr. Stockton. It may be true, that Mr. Stockton did not write the letter in question, and yet be equally true, that Mr. Webster did obtain, and exhibit to Mr. Walsh, Mr. Hopkinson, Mr. Stockton, Mr. McLane, and others, the *letter* which pledged Mr. Adams to bestow office on the federal party. The letter of Mr. Stockton, is introduced as a collateral matter, relating to the main fact, and it will not do for Mr. Hopkinson, Mr. Walsh and Mr. Webster, to remain longer silent upon *that* point. Is not the fact, that they are all silent as to the main point, whilst Mr. Hopkinson testifies, and Mr. Walsh publishes his statement, contradicting an immaterial issue, the strongest evidence of the truth of the main charge? Is it to be supposed, that witnesses so ready to testify upon a collateral point, would be silent upon the main point, if they could testify truly in behalf of the same party? Mr. Hopkinson, while he has asserted that no such letter was shown to Mr Stockton in his presence or to *his knowledge* at any other time and place, has taken special care not to say, that no such letter was ever shown to himself. It may be true, that Mr. Hopkinson was not present when the letter was shown to Mr. Stockton, and therefore it may be true, that such a letter was shown to Mr. Stockton, and yet untrue, that it was shown in the presence of Mr. Hopkinson; and the readiness of that gentleman to create an impression, that the whole statement is false, by certifying as to the immaterial issue, while he is silent as to his *own* knowledge of the existence of the letter, is one of the strongest points in this case to prove that the main point is true—and we assert, that it is capable of proof before any competent tribunal, who have power to compel the attendance of witnesses, that Mr. Webster has asserted, that he held such a letter. ☞Let Mr. Webster deny the charge, and let Mr. Adams nominate him to the Senate, so as to raise the question, and the fact will be proved.☜

A letter from a respectable gentleman in Kentucky remarks, that "Jackson's cause prospers in all directions; every base calumny adds to the list of his friends." So be it. Kentucky, Patriotic in war, and democratic in peace, will demonstrate to the world, that she is not transferable at the whim and caprice of one of her *apostate* sons.

THE SIX MILITIAMEN.

The policy of the present administration tends to encourage desertion, mutiny, and insubordination in the army of the United States. The Richmond Enquirer, commenting on this subject, says:

"We have before us an extract from Colonel Jones' Report of December 31st last, exhibiting the "magnitude of this growing evil" of desertion. In the years 1823, 4, 5, and 6, there were 2183 desertions out of 8024 men who were enlisted—and the loss in money by desertion, is estimated by the Adjutant General at $250,953."

Can that policy be a safe and patriotic one, which leads to such results? But some of the friends of Messrs. Adams and Clay, insist that there is a difference between regular soldiers and militia!! It is known, that the law has placed the militia, when called into service, under the same rules and regulations as regular soldiers, with the single exception, that the Courts Martial who pass sentence on them, are composed of militia officers. It is known, that we rely on a well regulated militia, as the main bulwark of our national defence. Let it once be understood, that *militia* are not to be punished for mutiny, desertion, or insubordination, and reliance can no longer be placed in them for the purposes of defence. Let it once be understood, that militia cannot be relied on for the national defence, and the old federal doctrine, of a large standing army, will follow of course. Let a large standing army be introduced, and our liberties will take wings and fly. Such is the policy of the federal party, who now support Mr. Adams. Let them once get the army, and all their fears of military chieftains will vanish. They will find some military chieftain of their own to subvert our liberties, and having corrupted the States, the overthrow of our Republican Institutions will follow as matter of course. Such has been the history of all ages. The objection to Gen Jackson, is not that he is a "Military Chieftain," but that he is not a Military Chieftain on *their* side. Mr. Adams and his friends were willing, aye, more than willing, to support him for Vice President. And Mr. Clay had much stronger apprehensions that the election of Mr. Adams would ruin the country, than he now pretends to have relative to Gen. Jackson. Let him but once see, that it will aid *his* elevation, and he will be as ready to unite with "a Military Chief" as he was to come to an understanding with Mr. Adams.

But to our first object. A typographical error in part of our edition, of the fifth number of our Extra, has given us no small provocation, and will be seized upon, no doubt, to produce an impression, that Col. Pipkin, and the troops under his command, were called out into service but for three months.

The letter of Gov. Blount to Gen. Jackson, is dated, December 2d, 1814, instead of December 22d, 1813. The most careless reader, by examining the article, will discover the error. Yet the business of the Editors in the pay of this Administration is to misrepresent. We expect this error of a single figure to be seized upon, for the purpose of charging Gen. Jackson with murder, although the next letter in order is dated January 11th, 1814. We will thank our brother Editors to note this.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published, weekly until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, MAY 7, 1828. No. 9

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, April 5, 1828.

Expenditures in the Department of State.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on so much of the Public Accounts and Expenditures as relates to the State Department, made the following

REPORT:

The Committee on so much of the Public Accounts and Expenditures as relates to the State Department, are required by the 75th standing rule of the House, to inquire and report "whether the expenditures of the Department are justified by law; whether the claims, from time to time, satisfied and discharged by the Department, are supported by sufficient vouchers, establishing their justness, both as to character and amount; whether any, and what, provisions are necessary to be adopted to provide more perfectly for the proper application of the public moneys, and to secure the Government from demands unjust in their character, or extravagant in their amount; whether any, and what, retrenchment can be made in the Department, without detriment to the public service; whether any, and what abuses at any time exist in the failure to enforce the payment of moneys which may be due to the United States from public defaulters, or others; and to report, from time to time, such provisions as may be necessary to add to economy of the Department, and the accountability of its officers—in obedience to which, they report:

That they proceeded to the discharge of the ties assigned them, commencing their inves gations with the year 1825, as, on the 3d of ebruary, of that year, a preceding committee ad, in their report to the House, embraced the sbursements of the State Department, up to e 31st of December, 1824, and which is on e in the office of the clerk of the House.— rom reference to the appropriation laws, it will e seen that the expenditures of the Depart ent are specific and contingent. To the first, onsisting of the salaries of the Secretary and lerks of the Department, and the patent of e, the committee have only inquired whether cy have been kept within the appropriation ts, which they find has been the case. The cond has more especially claimed the atten n of the committee, which must, from its n re, be (in its application) greatly at the dis tion of the Head of the Department. It con ts of the appropriations for the expenditures the Department; for the contingent expenses foreign intercourse; and the contingent ex ses of all the missions abroad

For the expenditures of the Department was appropriated in the year 1825, the sum of	$25,550 00
For the year 1826,	28,095 00
For the year 1827,	28,050 00
Making an aggregate of	$81,695 00

For the contingent expenses of Foreign Intercourse.

For 1825, - - - - -	$40,000 00
1826, - - - - -	40,000 00
1827, - - - - -	30,000 00
Making an aggregate of	$110,000 00

For the contingent expenses of all the Missions abroad.

In 1825, - - - -	$20,000 00
1826, - - - -	30,000 00
1827, - - - -	20,000 00
Making in the whole,	$70,000 00

The committee having ascertained the sum appropriated under the several heads before specified, addressed a letter to the Secretary of State, requesting to be furnished with a statement of the disbursements made out of the first mentioned appropriations, to whom paid, and for what services, with the vouchers for such payments; also, a statement of the disbursements made out of either of the latter appropriations, so far as they had been expended under his authority, and upon his voucher. To which, on the 4th instant, he returned his answer, accompanied by the statements A and B, together with the letters of the Register of the Treasury, the Fifth Auditor, and a letter addressed by Mr. Adams, then Secretary of State, to the Committee on the Expenditures of the State department, dated April the 18th, 1822, in explanation of the manner of transacting the pecuniary concerns of the office, and which are annexed to this report. Statement A contains the disbursements of the State Department, except for the printing and distribution of the acts of Congress, from the 31st December, 1824, to the 1st of January, 1828. B, the disbursements of the appropriations for the contingent expenses of Foreign Intercourse, from the 4th of March, 1825, to the 31st December, 1827, distinguishing between those items which had been allowed upon the certificate of the Secretary of State, from those which had been otherwise vouched. That no statement had been furnished of the disbursements of the appropriation for defraying the contingent expenses of all the missions abroad; because it appeared, upon examination of the accounts during the period particularized by the committee, that no item had been allowed upon

the special approval of the Secretary of State. In the letter of the Register of the Treasury, of the 12th inst., in answer to further inquiries made by the committee, it is stated that the appropriations for outfits, salaries, and the contingent expenses of missions abroad, have been uniformly blended in one account, denominated Diplomatic Department, and that payment for these various objects had been as uniformly made out of that general fund, without specification of object. In the same letter, it stated that the payment to John A King, Charge, &c. for salary and outfit, was made out of that fund; but that it had not been allowed upon the sole and exclusive voucher of the Secretary of State, but had been endorsed thus: "The President approves the above charges, 22d December, 1826. H. Clay." That, upon re-examination of the accounts, it had been found that Beaufort T. Watts, Charge des Affaires at Bogota, had been allowed, by the Chief Clerk, in the name of the Secretary, the sum of six hundred and fifteen dollars for newspapers, postage, and letter carrier; which communication is also annexed to this report.

The Committee will first notice the accounts of the disbursements in statement A, which are said to be all the disbursements made of the appropriations for defraying the contingent expenses of the Department, from the 31st of December, 1824, to the 1st of January, 1827, (except for the printing and distribution of the acts of Congress) which, for the same period, amounted to the sum of $38,243 35. The manner in which those disbursements are made, will be seen from the statement itself, and the letter of the Secretary of State to the Committee. William Brown, a clerk in the office, is allowed to receive sums in gross from the Treasury, upon requisitions of the Secretary of State, which are deposited by him in the office of the Bank of the United States, within this District, upon which, from time to time, he draws from the current expenses of the Department. The check upon him is, (it is said) that, after making his quarterly disbursements, an account thereof is furnished the Secretary of State, who writes his approval, which is understood to be an approval of the objects only, but not as dispensing with the exhibition of vouchers, in any instance, except where, from the nature of the expenditure, it is impracticable to produce them; in which case the propriety of the charges is judged of, and decided by the Head of the Department. As the head of the Department only approves the object of expenditure, without reference to the value of the articles purchased, or services performed, the committee were led to examine into the means afforded the Auditor in deciding upon the justness of the variety of claims discharged by the agent. The vouchers submitted to him are nothing more, in the general, than an uncorroborated statement of account, with the receipt of the claimant to Mr. Brown, as agent for the State Department.—The statement A, though not as full as some of the originals in the Register's Office, from whence they are taken may, to a very great extent, be said to furnish as ample means of ascertaining the correctness of the claims, as the original vouchers in the Register's Office. Hence, they conclude, that as to form, it is true, that the disbursements of the Agent are submitted to the Fifth Auditor for adjustment; but, it is also true, that, from all the evidence furnished him, (of which the Committee can have any knowledge,) the almost endless variety of articles and services for which compensation had been made, may not yet have been delivered or performed, and, if they were, at extravagant prices, without reference to their intrinsic value. The Committee are of opinion, that some higher standard than the judgment or discretion of a clerk in the office, (however virtuous and intelligent) should have been provided for testing the adequacy of compensations involving the payment of so large an amount of the public money.

The Committee have found it impossible for them to enter into a critical examination of the justness of the multiplied items in that account; many of them made out without such specification of the extent of services, as to enable the Committee to form any opinion of the adequacy of the compensation; and which (if practicable) would consume more time than the Committee could promise to devote to it, consistently with their other duties. They have so far analyzed the account in statement A, as to ascertain that the following amounts were disbursed by the agent for the purposes there stated.

For extra clerk hire in copying and Map tracing.

In the year	1825,	- -	$ 2,552 70
do	1826,	- -	7,561 00
do	1827,	- -	3,597 45
Total,	- - - -		$ 13,711 24

Extra Printing.

In the year	1825,	- -	2,488 35
do	1826,	- -	1,784 81
do	1827,	- -	1,036 36
Total,	- - - -		$ 5,309 42

Which is exclusive of the sum of $ 550, which in said statement is blended with stationary; part of which, is for printing, and the residue stationary, hence, the committee were unable to sever the respective amounts; which sum, if added to the above, would amount to - 5,859 42

For Stationary.

In the year	1825,	- -	$ 1,304 36
do	1826,	- -	2,058 42
do	1827,	- -	1,988 28
Total,			$ 5,351 06

Newspapers.

In the year	1825,	- -	370 69
do	1826,	- -	608 47
do	1827,	- -	444 00
Total,			$ 1,423 16

For Book and Newspaper Binding.

In the year	1825,	- -	70 76
do	1826,	- -	829 23
do	1827,	- -	1,431 75
Total			$ 2,331 74

Postage on letters to Messrs. Rent, and Thornton, (said to be on public business.)

In the year	1825,	53 05
do	1826,	146 55
do	1827,	94 30
Total,		$ 293 90

For Carpenter's and Cabinet work.

In the year	1825,	1,382 87
do	1826,	609 88
do	1827,	1,659 36
Total,		$ 3,602 12

Miscellaneous work, such as painting, plastering, graduating public ground, brick-laying, &c. and materials,

In the year	1825,	2,779 80
do	1826,	1,102 97
do	1827,	1,831 25
Total,		$ 5,714 02

The Committee have not carried out the residue of the accounts in said statement, inasmuch as they are so various in their character, that they would not fall under general heads, nor indeed would they be susceptible of classification under any one head in the general estimates furnished by the Secretary of State, upon which the appropriations were founded. Such are the charges of $250 for the portrait of Washington, and $10 for a medal, and $13 for a print of the President of the United States, which, though of inconsiderable amount, nevertheless involve principle to as great an extent as would a larger amount. If the Head of a Department can (consistently with principle) apply the contingent funds appropriated for the current expenses of his office to such objects, the committee can see no limit to his discretion, save that of the fund at his disposal; which, if sufficiently ample, he might apply to the erection of a monument on the public ground, to perpetuate the memory of whomsoever he might think proper.

The Committee likewise would remark upon the compensation to Thomas Miller and Thomas M. Bailey, who were severally employed by the Secretary of State; Miller to Accomac, Virginia, $140 for nine days' services; Bailey for twice travelling from the same place to Washington, and returning; for the first trip he was paid $284 40; for the second, $370 20, without specification of time. They assume the data furnished in the case of Mr. Miller as being the criterion by which to judge of the justice of the compensation in each. In that case the compensation is stated at $8 per day, making $72; and the remaining $68 is given for his expenses, of a journey which the Committee believe does not exceed the distance of two hundred miles. At that rate of allowance, the daily compensation and expenses would fall but little short of $ 16, which the committee believe to be extravagant. They find in the statement, charges for carpeting purchased for the office, during the period embraced in their inquiries, and for making and laying them, near the sum of five hundred dollars, which is not included in either of the specifications which they have made in this report.

The committee have seen with surprise that, whilst the appropriations have increased for the three last years, that the disbursements of the Department have, for the same time, greatly exceeded the annual appropriations, which will be seen from comparing the statement furnished the committee by the Register of the Treasury with the amount of appropriations, (exclusive of those for printing and distributing the laws of Congress,) and which statement or summary the committee annex to this report, and, for its better identification, they designate it by the letter D That statement exhibits only an excess of expenditure (exclusive of publishing and distribution of the laws) for the years 1825, '6, and '7, of the sum of $ 10,600 dollars, the amount of the unexpended balance at the close of the year 1824.

From reference to the statement A. it will be seen that the actual expenditures of the Department (exclusive of printing and publishing the laws) in fact amount to the sum of $52,359 75, instead of $44,805, as stated in statement D. making an additional excess of expenditure, over the unexpended balance of 1824, and the annual appropriations, of the sum of $7,554 75. That excess, the Committee apprehend, has been met by the fees received from the Patent Office, and the unexpended balance of the appropriations made for printing and distribution of the laws; which they find in the same statement, amounted, on the 31st of December, 1824, to the sum of $5,558, and on the close of the year 1827, to the sum of $7,558; being at that time, about equal to the excess of expenditure before stated.

The committee, upon contrasting the expentures of the State Department for the three last years, with those years which preceded them, cannot (consistently with that economy which should be exercised in the disbursement of public money) account for the increased expenditure. From the statement annexed to the report of the former committee, made to the House in the session of 1824–5 the expenditure of the Department for those years amounted to the sum of $35,311 18, averaging something more than $17,000 per annum; when the expenditures for each of the years embraced in the inquiries of the committee, will average more than $32,000.

The committee have viewed the appropriations for the current expenses of the Department as being strictly contingent, which, though technically true, cannot be so in point of fact. However indefinite the appropriation laws may be, they are predicated upon an estimate furnished by the Secretary of State, specifying the various objects to which there is a necessity for the appropriation of public money; which estimate, owing to the faith reposed in the public officer, founded upon his experimental knowledge of the necessities of the Department, is received as the basis on which such appropriations are made. Hence an unlimited exercise of discretion cannot be assumed in the after disbursements of the money, in disregard of the enumeration which he has made of the objects, without violating that faith which was reposed in his estimate. The committee, from that consideration, have adverted to the estimates presented for each of the years to which they have extended their inquiries, as to the sum necessary to meet

the exigencies of the Department for extra clerk hire, which they find has uniformly been $1,000—that sum for the three years would amount to $3,000; when, in fact, there was expended, during that period, more than four times that amount. Under the act of 20th April, 1818, (which regulated the amount of the specific appropriation for the clerks of the Department,) there was appropriated for the years 1825 and '26, each, the sum of $15,000 for clerks. By the act of the 2d of March, 1827, there was an addition of $4,400 made to the former appropriation; making the sum of $20,300 for that year; notwithstanding which, there was expended of the contingent fund for extra clerk hire, more than $1,000 over the expenditure of 1825, for the same object.

The committee are unable to say whether the mechanical and other labor, and materials furnished, constituting so large an item in their former classification, were necessary, and, if so, were performed and furnished at their equitable value, as it was impossible for them to traverse so wide a field in their investigations; but this they will say, that, if such expenditure was called for, instead of resort being had for nine thousand dollars to the contingent fund, an appropriation should have been made by Congress for these objects, and the precaution used of disbursing it under the superintendent of the public buildings, rather than the discretion of a clerk who, in the nature of things, must have been more incompetent to the task than one skilled in mechanics. The committee can recommend no mode better calculated to promote economy in the disbursements of the Department, than (where practicable) to specify, in the appropriation laws, the several objects to which such appropriations shall be applied—leaving as little as possible to the discretion of the officer. That all the objects of expenditure could be foreseen, so as to be provided for, is not to be expected; allowance must ever be made for unforeseen cases; but the committee are of opinion, that much greater precaution could be used than has hitherto characterized the legislation of Congress on that subject.

The committee have herein before stated, that the amount appropriated for the printing and distribution of the laws of Congress, for the years before stated, amounted to the sum of $47,500, which, with $5,558; the unexpended balance of former years, amounted to the sum of $53,058.

Of that sum was expended for these objects, in the year	
1825, - - -	$11,500
In 1826, - - -	16,500
In 1827, - - -	17,500
	$45,500

Leaving unexpended of that fund, on the 31st of December, 1827, the sum of $7,558. The expenditure of those appropriations, and indeed, for printing generally, are at the discretion of the head of the Department, except so far as there is a limitation fixed by the third section of the act of 1818, upon that discretion, in regard to the compensation of the proprietors of newspapers in which the laws, resolutions, &c. shall be published. As this subject was so fully discussed in the House during the [illegible] Congress, and must be so well understood, the committee forbear to make any recommendation thereon.

The committee beg leave to add, that, from the document A, it appears that the sum of $197 was paid to Peter Force, out of the contingent fund of the Department, for publishing proclamations of Indian treaties, when, from a reference to the act of Congress of May, 1820, it will appear that the publication of such treaties are expressly confined to one paper, and that to be within the limits of the State or Territory to which the subject-matter of such treaty shall belong.

They are of opinion, from the best information which they can obtain, that the distribution can still be made through the Post Office Department, without detriment to the public service, certainly by the mail contractors, for a very trifling amount, compared with that of private agents, as now practised. They, therefore, recommend the expediency of withholding the appropriation of $3,500 from future acts, and that said distribution be made through the agency of the Postmaster General.

The Committee have been induced to examine the library of the State Department, from having seen a standing annual estimate of $2,000 per annum for the purchase of books. It embraces the statutes, compilations, and digests of the Laws of the United States and of the several States and Territories, Foreign Statutes and Digests, National Law, Common Civil, and Municipal Law, and Reports thereof, Treaties, Conventions, and Histories of Negotiations, Journals and Histories of Legislative Bodies, and State Papers; Scientific Geography, Voyages and Travels, History, Biography, Medicine, Chemistry, and Anatomy, Statistics, Political Economy, &c.; Miscellaneous, with the Magazines, Reviews, Newspapers, and Public Journals of the States, as well as foreign countries; Atlasses, Maps, Charts, &c. The Committee can discover no necessity for so extensive a library in that Department; embracing works which cannot possibly be required in the discharge of official duties, and which involve so much expense, without being called into use. They are induced to recommend the expediency of withholding that appropriation, (to great extent,) in future, from the following considerations: 1st. The inutility of very many of these books; 2d, That access to the Library of Congress could be afforded to each of the officers of the Government, for such books as might be desired, and which were not necessary to impart information in the discharge of official duties; such as Law, Medicine, Chemistry, Anatomy, Miscellaneous, &c. 3d, From the fact that a Librarian, at the annual salary of $1,400, appears now to be incompetent to make out the catalogue of so extensive a library, without employing assistants, at an expense of $90 to the Government, as appears from statement A, hereto annexed.

The Committee will now notice the second statement, denominated B: which, with an appropriate supplement attached to it, purports to be a expose of the disbursements made of the appropriations for the contingent expenses of Foreign Intercourse, from the 4th of March, 1825, to the 31st December, 1827; distinguishing, in differerent columns, between the items which had been allowed under the authority

and upon the voucher of the Secretary of State, from those which had been otherwise vouched. It appears, from the exhibit D, that, on the 31st of December, 1824, there was, of the appropriations to that object, an unexpended balance of $17,306 39; which, with the sum of $113 66, repaid into the Treasury during the years 1825, '6, and '7, will, when added to the amount of the annual appropriations, as herein before stated, amount, in the whole, to the sum of $127,420 05

Of which sum was expended—	
In the year 1825, - -	25,572 68
1826, - -	18,633 00
1827, - -	36,258 63
Total,	$80,567 97
Leaving an unexpended balance, on the 31st day of December last, of	$46,853 08

From the fact that to the Committee on Public Expenditures, and the Select Committee on Retrenchment, belong more properly the consideration of most of the subjects growing out of that disbursement, your Committee have only noticed such parts thereof as fall within the legitimate scope of their inquiries. They have ascertained that, for the years 1825, '6, and '7, there was paid out of that fund, for extra clerk hire, the sum of $1,871 78, which, with the sum of $18,711 24, expended for that purpose, of the contingent fund of the State Department within the same period, amounts, in the whole, to the sum of $15,683 02; a sum nearly equal to one-third of the amount annually appropriated for the whole clerks of the Department and Patent Office. The committee are of opinion that the compensation to each clerk employed in the Department (whether for general or special purposes,) properly devolves upon the appropriations for the Department, and ought to be paid out of that fund, if for no other reason than that the disbursements would be more simple, less difficult to understand, and not so liable to abuse.

The Committee have also extracted from the said statement, the amount paid out of that fund for extra printing, during the same period, which thy find amounts to the sum of $2,967 52 $2,455 33, of which amount, was for publishing notice to the St. Domingo exiles.

They also find, that, of the sum hereinbefore stated to have been paid for printing, out of the contingent appropriations for the State De-Department, $1,205 00 was for the same object; making (according to those statements) the sum of $3,660 72, paid for the publication of that notice, out of the different appropriations before specified. The Committee are unable to perceive why, for the same services, disbursements have been made out of both those funds. Surely, the appropriations for the contingent expenses of the Department, and that of foreign intercourse, are dissimilar in their characters, and could not have been intended by Congress to be thus blended. The committee will not particularize the persons employed to publish that notice, or the amounts paid; as the respective accounts are annexed to this report, to which reference can be had for that purpose. They will here repeat what they have said on the subject of printing, in the first statement: that the compensation for that service is exclusively at the discretion of the Head of the Department; and the House will be better enabled to judge of the expediency of regulating by law that compensation, than the committee. From the Statement B, it will be seen, that $16,304 92 of the appropriations for the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse, has been expended upon the certificate of the Secretary of State; the greater part whereof has been paid to the bearers of despatches. The committee have no means of ascertaining the necessity for employing special agents, to the extent practised, that must, necessarily, be referred to the discretion of the Head of the Department; and the greatest security against the mis-application of that fund will be found in his integrity. They are unable to say, by what rule the Secretary of State determines upon the amount of expenses incident upon such agencies, which (in the case of John Mason, jr.) more than doubles the amount of daily compensation. In that account there is an item of $278 for hire of a coach from Mexico to Vera Cruz; also, expenses from Mexico to Vera Cruz, including two days detention at the latter place, $78; making $356 for carriage hire and expenses.

In the account of Theodore W. Clay, allowance is made for carriage hire,

from Mexico to Vera Cruz, - -	$75 00
Expenses to ditto, - - -	23 25
Total,	$98 25

Making a difference, in charge, for the same distance, and travelling in the like manner, of $258, in favor of Mr. Mason.

They find, in the same statement, the sum of $1,940 paid to John H. Pleasants, for bearing despatches to Buenos Ayres and Rio Janeiro, and his expenses. That Mr. Pleasants was employed by the Secretary of State to perform that service, and did set out on his journey, the Committee believe to be true; but that he performed the journey particularized on his account, and for which he was paid, they believe to be untrue. Whether prevented by indisposition or otherwise, from performing the service, the Committee are of opinion the fact should have been stated, and the records of the country been made to prove the services for which the public money was disbursed. As the case now stands, they are furnished with no means of determining upon the adequacy of the compensation paid. All they can say, from the evidence furnished from the statement B, is, that the said John H. Pleasants was not entitled to compensation for bearing despatches to Buenos Ayres and Rio Janeiro, as stated in his account. They recommend to the House the propriety of fixing by law the compensation of Special Agents, on such basis as would do justice to them, and exempt the Government from impositions. In the same statement, they discover an item of 200 dollars paid, upon the certificate of the Secretary of State, to W. Prentiss, for his expenses in delivering a box of books to the Governor of Maine. The vouchers furnish no evidence of the description of books, or of their quantity, so as to enable the Committee to judge of the justness of the compensation, or of the fund out of which it should have been paid. They were informed, at the

register's office of the Treasury, that they were the Acts, Journals, or Documents of Congress. If so, such claim was not chargeable upon the contingent fund for foreign intercourse, but upon the current expenses of the Department, and should have been supported by proper vouchers.

The Committee will now advert to the appropriations "for defraying the contingent expenses of all the missions abroad;" for the disbursement of which, no statement has been furnished them, because it appeared, on examination, that no disbursements of that appropriation had been made upon the certificate of the Secretary of State, save the cases of John A. King, Charge des Affaires at London, and Beaufort T. Watts, Charge des Affaires at Bogota, mentioned in the letter of the Register of the Treasury, annexed to this report. The attention of the Committee has been directed to the former case, because it was brought before the last Congress, by a member of this committee, and has since been a subject on which much has been said in the House. The whole amount of that claim is $5,258 15, and is stated thus:

"John A. King, Charge des Affaires at London, for his salary from the 1st of July, 1826, the day on which his duties commenced, to the 31st of August following, when they terminated, sixty-two days, at $4,500 per annum, $758 15

For amount of his outfit, equal to one years salary, - - - - 4,500 00

$5,258 15

Endorsed thus: "The President approves the above charges, 22d December, 1826.

H. CLAY."

John A. King had been appointed Secretary of Legation to Rufus King, Minister to the Court of St. James, in 1826, by the President, with the advice of the Senate, proceeded with the Minister to that Court, and, after the President had been notified by Mr. King of his intention to return, and after his successor had been appointed, and was on his way to relieve him, the Minister retired from the Court, leaving the said John A. King in charge of the Legation, for the period of sixty-two days, for which, the beforementioned compensation was allowed. The payment of this claim, (in the opinion of the Committee,) was not authorized by law, nor was it of that description of claims, which were designated to be paid out of the contingent fund. They have necessarily adverted to the act of Congress, fixing the compensation of public Ministers, in the acts of 1810, chap. 61, sections 1 and 2, and which is in the following words: "That the President of the United States shall not allow to any Minister Plenipotentiary, a greater sum, than at the rate of 9,000 dollars per annum, as a compensation for all his personal services and expences; nor to any Charge des Affaires, a greater sum than at the rate of four thousand five hundred dollars per annum, as a compensation for all his personal services and expenses; nor to the Secretary of any Legation or Embassy to any foreign country, or Secretary to any Minister Plenipotentiary, a greater sum than at the rate of $2,000 per annum, as a compensation for all his personal services and expenses; with this proviso, that it shall be lawful for the President of the United States to allow to a Minister Plenipotentiary, or Charges des Affaires, on going from the United States to any foreign country, an outfit, which shall in no case exceed one full years' salary of such Minister or Charge des Affaires." The second section enacts, "that to entitle any Charge des Affaires, or Secretary of any Legation, or embassy to any foreign country, or Secretary of any Minister Plenipotentiary, to the compensation therein before provided, they shall respectively be appointed by the President of the U States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; but, in the recess of the Senate, the President is hereby authorized to make such appointment, which shall be submitted to the Senate at the next session thereafter, for their advice and consent; and no compensation shall be allowed to any Charge des Affairs, or any of the Secretaries hereinbefore described, who shall not have been appointed as aforesaid."

The Committee are of opinion that, under the provisions of the before recited law, the appointment of a Charge des Affairs can only be made by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (if in session;) if not, then, to be nominated to the Senate at the next session thereafter, for their advice and consent. The compensation, when thus appointed, cannot exceed four thousand five hundred dollars per annum, "for all his personal services and expenses," with this exception, "that on going from the United States to a foreign country," the President of the United States, at his discretion, (which discretion can only be exercised when the appropriation is made,) may allow an outfit, which shall in no case exceed the amount of one years salary. In the case now under consideration, Mr. King was not appointed by the President of the United States with, or without the consent of the Senate, nor had he "gone from the United States to a foreign country," as Charge des Affairs, but was, at the time of the appointment being conferred on him by the Minister, the acting Secretary of Legation, and in the pay of his government as such. The committee will not controvert, (upon the death or absence of the Minister) the necessity of the Secretary of Legation taking charge of the archives, and transacting the ordinary business of the Legation; nor would they be tenacious of the title conferred by such contingent agency; but they do deny the right to compensate for such appointment, when forbidden by the plain and direct provisions of the act of Congress before recited, more especially when no appropriation had been made therefor, and when Congress was in session at the time the allowance was made to Mr. King out of the contingent fund; which fund, (in the opinion of the committee,) was not subject to the payment of salaries and outfits of Ministers and Charges—their compensations being specific subjects of appropriation. If the committee be correct in their construction of the law, a long series of departure from its provisions cannot justify the act of usurpation, but, on the contrary, calls more loudly for a strict compliance with them. The committee discard precedents made in violation of law, because usur-

pation to-day, may (and frequently does) become precedent to-morrow. They can recommend no rule which promises more safety than frequently to inquire into delegated power; compare the act done with the authority for doing it; and, in that way, circumscribe the agents of the Government (without respect to grade) to the limits of their authority.

The Committee, from inspection of the records and accounts of the Treasury Department, have ascertained that much, if not the greater part of the annual appropriation for the contingent expenses of all the missions abroad, has been disbursed for the contingent expenses of Ministers and Charges abroad; some of which have been settled, and others remain unsettled. They have called for, and obtained an abstract of the accounts settled for the year 1825, as for that year a greater portion of the accounts have been settled at the Department than for subsequent years, which statement they annex to this report, and mark G. The committee will again advert to the before recited act of Congress, in order to show that whatever may have been the causes which superinduced the practice of defraying the expenses of Ministers abroad out of this fund, that such practice is without legal sanction, and can only be supported by construction. That part of the act aforesaid which provides for compensation, is, "that the President of the United States shall not allow to any Minister Plenipotentiary a greater sum than at the rate of nine thousand dollars per annum, as a compensation for all his personal services and expenses."—The Committee believe, that it was the intention of Congress to fix, in the act of 1810, the salaries of Ministers and Charges des Affaires, so that nothing should thereafter be left to discretion; else, why use the strong language "for all his personal services and expenses?" if it was intended only to regulate the compensation for personal expenses, as contradistinguished from official, why not provide for such expenses as were not included in the salary?—They are of opinion that eighteen thousand dollars per annum to a Minister, and nine thousand dollars to a Charge des Affaires, are amply sufficient to cover all the expenses contingent upon such missions. If in this they are mistaken, still, it must be conceded that direct legislation upon the increase of salary, is preferable to the present practice; which leaves to the discretion of the Department, the extent to which allowances shall be made, and which, necessarily, must depend upon the naked memorandum furnished by the Secretary of Legation. Believing that the appropriation for defraying the contingent expenses of all the Missions abroad has been expended at the discretion of the Department, and without the authority of law, other than the appropriation acts, the Committee recommend, in future, withholding that appropriation; but if, in the opinion of the House, the salaries allowed by the act aforesaid are insufficient to cover all expenses, then, and in that case, to make such specific additions as shall be deemed amply sufficient.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington 4th March, 1828.

Hon. JOHN BLAIR, *Chairman, &c.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt, on the 6th ult. of your letter, bearing date on the 4th, as Chairman of the Committee on so much of the Public Accounts and Expenditures as relates to the State Department; and, also, on the 7th of the same month, your letter of the 5th. By the former, the Committee request to be furnished, first, "with a statement of the incidental and contingent disbursements of this office; showing therein the respective sums paid, to whom, and for what services, with the vouchers for such payments." And, secondly, "a statement showing the disbursements made out of either of the appropriations for the contingent expenses of all missions abroad," and "for the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse," so far as either of these appropriations have been expended under the authority of the Secretary of State, and upon his voucher, for the use of that Department;" leaving it to my discretion whether I would recur, or not, to a period beyond the commencement of my service in the Department of State. In your second letter, you state that the Committee on the Expenditures of the State Department, having examined the accounts of the Department, and reported up to the year 1824, inclusive, it will not be necessary that the statements previously required by you, should embrace any period prior to the commencement of the year 1825.

In compliance with the request of the Committee, I transmit, herewith, a statement of the contingent expenses of the Department of State, from the 1st day of January, 1825, to the 31st December, 1827, marked A. The account has been settled by the proper officers of the Treasury, for the whole period. The vouchers supporting the various charges in the account, after having been examined and scrutinized by the proper Auditor, have been passed to the Register of the Treasury, in whose office they now remain on file. A copy of every one of them would occupy much space, and require considerable time to prepare it. Mr. Brent, the first clerk in the Department, having understood from you that it would not be wanted, it is not, therefore, now sent. If he misunderstood the wishes of the Committee in that respect I will, upon receiving information to that effect, direct a transcript of the vouchers to be made.

I have also the honor to communicate to the Committee, a letter from the Fifth Auditor, transmitting the second statement, (which is designated by the letter B,) requested by the Committee, accompanied by an explanatory letter, from the Register of the Treasury. This statement shows all the disbursements made out of the appropriation for the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse, from the 4th of March, 1825, to the end of the last year; distinguishing between those items which have been allowed on my authority, and upon my certificate of approval, from those which have been otherwise vouched. In examining the accounts containing the contingent expenses of all the missions abroad, during the period particularized by the Committee, no item was found to have been allowed on my special approval; and, consequently, there is no statement to be furnished of disbursements from that appropriation, according to the request of the Committee.

So far as disbursements take place at home,

of appropriations at the disposal of the Department of State, they are made by an Agent of the Department, for that purpose designated. This practice has prevailed for a long time. It can be traced back, at least, as far as the ministry of Mr. Madison. The person selected for the agency has been, most generally, for many years past, exclusively, one of the clerks in the Department. He draws, from time to time, upon the requisitions of the Head of the Department, the necessary sums, under particular appropriations, for covering the ordinary disbursements. These sums are placed to his credit, in the office of the Bank of the U. States, within this District, where he keeps his account, and upon which he draws, from time to time, for the current expenditures. No part of the money appropriated to the public service, under the direction of the Department of State, has ever been placed to my private credit. The accounts of the Agent are settled quarterly, and are examined by the Head of the Department, who usually writes his approval at the foot of them. This approval is understood by the Auditor as sanctioning the *object* of expenditure, but not as dispensing with the exhibition of vouchers in any instance, except where, from the nature of the expenditure, it is impracticable to produce them; in which cases the propriety of the charge is judged of and decided by the Head of the Department. Due attention is, of course, paid to the amount drawn from the Treasury by the Agent, so as to prevent an unreasonably large sum, at any period, accumulating in his hands. The clerk who, when I entered the Department, was charged with its pecuniary agency, continues to execute it.

The above mode of transacting the pecuniary affairs of the office, was fully explained by my predecessor in a letter which he addressed to a former committee of the House of Representatives, under date the 18th of April, 1822, to a copy of which, herewith transmitted, the Committee are respectfully referred, marked C.

Upon an examination of the statement exhibiting the disbursements out of the appropriation for the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse, which have been made in the three last years, under my authority, and upon my certificate or voucher, it will be observed that the principal item is for the employment, during those years, of bearers of dispatches. Their compensation and allowances have not varied, as far as any traces of them can be perceived in the Treasury, since the establishment of the Government. Their compensation was fixed at a per diem of six dollars, with an allowance of their travelling expenses, including the price of their passage by sea, when they do not proceed in a public vessel. Whenever a messenger is dispatched upon this service, he is furnished with a letter of instructions, in which his duty and destination are mentioned; and in which, also, it is stated that the above compensation and allowances will be made him. Upon the return of the messenger, it is, of course, known in the Department how long he has been absent on the public service; and it is not difficult to judge of the reasonableness of his charges for travelling expenses and passage money. This latter sum is, indeed, usually fixed, from the ordinary charges in similar cases, information of which is obtained through the customary channels, and the amount is specified in the instructions. The statement, therefore, that the compensation and charges allowed to bearers of despatches are unvouched, is not substantially, if it be technically, correct. Their accounts are first carefully examined in the Department of State, where they are checked by the means in the possession of that Department, and then approved and certified by the head of the Department, and passed over to the Fifth Auditor.

The employment of bearers of despatches is limited to important occasions, in which the Department cannot avail itself of the agency of regular packets, periodically sailing, or where, from the high interest and confidential nature of the despatches, it is deemed best to expose them to as little casuality as possible. They are generally employed in the transmission of treaties prior to their promulgation, in consequence of the magnitude of the interests which they involve, and the respect which is due to existing usage in national intercourse. To most of the persons who have been employed in that character, during the last three years, were confided either treaties, or the credentials and the general instructions to some of our Ministers abroad. Thus, in 1825, John H. Pleasants was engaged to carry their credentials and general instructions to our Charges d'Affairs at Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Ayres, where they were then respectively residing; and, in 1827, John Mason, jr. was paid, as a bearer of despatches for bringing home a treaty, which had been negotiated at Mexico, and Theodore W. Clay was engaged, in March last, to carry back to Mexico the same treaty, after it had been submitted to the Senate, and, also, to carry other highly confidential despatches to Mr. Poinsett, and despatches to Mr. Sergeant, who had left the United States the preceding November.

The greater part of our despatches to and from Europe, generally pass through the hands of our consul, Mr. Maury, at Liverpool, and hence the heavy charge for postage, which forms the first item in the statement now transmitted.

I have the honor to be,

With great respect,

Your obedient servant,

H. CLAY

Mr. Pleasanton to Mr. Clay.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

Fifth Auditor's Office, February 27, 1828.

SIR: I have had the honor to receive your letter of the 16th instant, requesting a statement, for the use of the commitee, on so much of the public accounts as relates to the State Department, shewing the disbursements made out of either of the appropriations "for the contingent expenses of all missions abroad," and "for the contingent of foreign intercourse," *so far as either of those appropriations have been expended under the authority of the Secretary of State, and upon his voucher, for the use of that Department;* and, as the accounts relative to those appropriations, after being audited by this office, and passed by the Comptroller, are transmitted to, filed, and retained in the office of the Register of the Treasury, I referred your letter to that officer with

out delay, with a request that he would comply with its requisitions. He has, accordingly, prepared and transmitted a statement, in which is distinguished the accounts which have been settled on your authority and certificate, and those settled upon the customary vouchers. There are some items of expense in the statement which were authorized and incurred by, and during, the late Administration, but for which, the accounts were not rendered, settled, and paid, until after the commencement of the present. Such are the accounts of Mr. Thomas Randall, Agent at Havana, and of Ether Shepley, for collecting testimony in relation to outrages upon certain American fishing vessels near Halifax. As the payments were made during the period specified in the call of the committee, though the service was previously performed, it was thought proper to comprehend them in the statement.

It may be proper to remark, that the per diem allowances to bearers of despatches, and their expenses whilst absent, contained in the statement, are in conformity with those uniformly made, in similar cases, under the Administrations of Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, and Mr. Monroe.

In regard to this description of accounts, it being impossible for this office accurately to ascertain the period for which payment ought to be made, in all cases, and for the party rendering the account to produce vouchers for his travelling expenses, to dispense with which, the authority of the Secretary of State is considered necessary, recourse has, generally, been had to the Secretary of State for his sanction to such part of the account as he should approve; these accounts are, therefore, generally entered as being approved by him. The receipt of the agent, claiming the account due, is always exacted, and filed in the proper office, upon payment being made.

In further explanation of the statement, I have the honor to enclose the letter of the Register of the Treasury to me, upon the subject.

I have the honor to be,
Very respectfully, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
S. PLEASONTON,
Fifth Auditor of the Treasury.

The Hon. HENRY CLAY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Nourse to Mr. Pleasonton.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Register's Office, February 25, 1828.

Sir: In compliance with the letter of the Secretary of State, of the 16th, addressed to you, and which was referred to this office, on the 18th, instant, I have the honor to transmit herewith, a statment, showing the disbursements made out of the appropriation for the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse, so far as it has been expended under the authority of the Secretary of State, and upon his voucher, for the use of that Department, from the 4th of March, 1825, to the present time; all which has been extracted from the accounts as settled at your office.

In making up this statement, you will perceive, that we have set down, as vouched by the Secretary, all those accounts upon which his name is endorsed, as approving the same, except the accounts of the disbursing agent of the Department; and from these we have selected, and set down, such items as were specially approved. Upon this, we must remark, that many items in these accounts, though without vouchers, have no doubt been allowed upon the common principles of settlement, as not requiring the special sanction of the Secretary for their admission: but, from the want of specified data, in the accounts themselves, we have been unable to make distinctions.

In examining the accounts containing the contingent expenses of mission abroad, for the above period, we have not been able to discover any item as allowed upon the special approval of the Secretary of State.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
JOSEPH NOURSE, *Register.*

STEPHEN PLEASONTON, Esq.
Fifth Auditor of the Treasury.

B.

STATEMENT showing the disbursements made out of the appropriation for the contingent expenses of Foreign Intercourse, from the 4th March, 1825, to the 31st December, 1827; distinguishing between those items which have been allowed under the authority and upon the certificate of the Secretary of State, from those which have been otherwise vouched.

In whose favor and for what purpose.	Approved by Secretary of State without vouchers.	Accounts vouched.
1825.		
To James Maury, Consul at Liverpool, for postages on letters and packages to and from Ministers and other Public Agents in Europe, from 1st July to 31st December, 1824, including a premium thereon, for exchange between Liverpool and the United States	$272 17	
To William J. Stone, for engraving two copy plates for ciphers, and printing 92 impressions of plates, including paper	298 80	
To Lary Anderson, for his services from 29th December, 1824, to the 18th February, 1825, making 51 days at $6 per day, and travelling expenses from Carthagena to Bogota, and from thence to Washington as bearer of the Convention between the United States and Colombia	1,190 00	
To Thomas Randall, Agent for Commerce and Seamen at Porto Rico and Havana, and for bal-		

ance of his salary from 30th of April, 1825, to 18th March, 1825, at $4,500 per annum - 4,540 39

To George S. Watkins, Special Messenger of the United States' to the Minister at London, for compensation from 12th March to 1st July, 1825, making 112 days, at 6 dollars per day, including his passage out and returning, travelling expenses from Washington to New York, from Liverpool to London, and from London to Liverpool, on his return, and from New York back to Washington - 1,347 68

To John H. Pleasants, bearer of despatches to Buenos Ayres and Rio Janeiro, for his compensation from 19th April to 22d August, 1825, making 126 days, at $6 per day, including his passage, going and returning, his travelling expenses and boarding, from the time of his leaving Richmond on the 19th April, to the 28th May, 1825, in which interval he was seeking, from Baltimore to Boston, the means of getting to Buenos Ayres, and his expenses in returning from New York to Richmond - 1,940 00

To Peter Force, for publishing Exequaturs - - 42 00

To William Maul, for sealing Mediterranean passports - - - - 6 00

To L. Child, sign board for the Legation at Buenos Ayres - - - 30 75

To H. Niles, for 52 copies of the Weekly Register - - 152 75

To S. Masi, for a great seal, and box for the same, and three treaty boxes - - - - 106 00

To Ether Shepley, for expenses in relation to capture of fishermen by British brig Dotterill 250 00

To Joseph Milligan, for two port folios, for treaties - 200 00

To W. J. Stone, for printing passports and impressions of Ministers' coats - - - - 37 00

To Mary Lengthall, for painting signal flags, - - 5 00

To Patrick Rogers, for diplomatic trunks, - - - 91 00

To J. Milligan, for four port folios, for treaties, - - 400 00

To W. Slade, Jr. for bearing despatches to New York - - - - - 100 00

F. C. Baker, for bearing despatches to Norfolk, to Mr. Miller, - - - - 40 00

To Patrick Rogers for diplomatic trunks, - - - - 26 00

To Peter Force, for publishing exequaturs, - - - 11 50

To W. J. Stone, for engraving flags, - - - - - 16 00

To James Maury, Consul at Liverpool, for postages in England, - - - - - 266 58

To Peter Force, for publishing exequaturs, - - - 6 00

To H. Niles, for 52 copies of the Weekly Register, - - 153 25

To Gustavus H. Scott, bearer of despatches from the Secretary of State to the Minister at Bogota, for his travelling expenses from his residence in Virginia, to Washington, and from thence to Norfolk, via. Baltimore, to take passage on board the John Adams frigate; for sea stores, stationery, expenses of transmitting the despatches from Carthagena to Bogota; passage from Carthagena to New York, and travelling expenses from New York to his residence in Virginia. via. Washington, including the sum of 792 dollars for his services in said capacity, at 6 dollars per day, from the 11th of March to the 20th July, 1826, - - $968 32 $496 77

To John Marshall, bearer of despatches from the Charge des Affairs at Guatemala to the Secretary of State, for his compensation from 5th August to 31st October, 1826, making 88 days, at six dollars per day, including his expenses from the 19th of April, when he was detailed from the frigate John Adams for the purpose of attending Mr. Williams, to the 31st August 1826, - - - - 1,528 00

To Clifton Wharton, bearer of despatches to Colombia, for his compensation from 22d of May to 26th October, 1826, making 159 days, at $6 per day including his travelling and necessary expenses from Washington to N. York; expenses while

there, necessary expenses at the Caicos Islands after his shipwreck, passage, &c. from Turk's Island to Carthagena—medical aid at Carthagena; passage from thence to NewYork, and travelling expenses from New York to Washington, including also sundry articles of clothing purchased at Turk's Island, after being shipwrecked, he having landed there in a state of destitution,	1,191 50	830 75
To John A. Dix, bearer of despatches to copenhagen for compensation from 17th May to 14th October, 1826, at six dollars per day including his travelling expenses ses from Washington to NewYork; passage from thence to Liverpool; travelling expenses, &c. from Liverpool to Copenhagen, and from thence to Paris and Havre including passports postages, carriage hire, passage from Havre to N. York, and travelling expenses from NewYork back to Washington	1,608 20	17 15
To Robert Anderson, bearer of despatches from Carthagena to Washington, for his travelling expenses and passage from Carthagena to New York, and from thence to Washington, including his compensation from the 24th of July to the 21st of Sept. 1826, making 52 days, at $6 per day	504 00	
To Edward Wyer, bearer of despatches to & from St. Petersburgh, for his compensation from 29th April to the 15th Nov. 1826, making 201 days, at $6 per day, including travelling expenses from Washington to N. York, passage from thence to Constadt, from thence to Boston, and expenses to Washington	1,902 00	
To Peter Force for publishing exequaturs		16 00
To Gales & Seaton, for publishing exequaturs & signals		27 00
To John Myers, for two diplomatic trunks		18 00
To Davis & Force, for printing 50 copies directions for Ministers' dress		2 50
To A. W. Bell, for two diplomatic trunks		18 00
To H Niles, for six vols. Weekly Register		18 75
To James Maury, Consul at Liverpool, for postage in England		137 82
To M. M. Cruikshank, for a port folio for a treaty		55 00
To John Myers, for a diplomatic trunk		5 00
To H. Niles, for 52 copies of the Weekly Register		153 50
To A. W. Bell, for two diplomatic trunks		18 00
To S. Massi, for 24 castings of the great seal		50 00
To A. W. Bell, for two diplomatic trunks		22 00
To M. M. Cruikshank, for a port folio, full trimmed, &c.		65 00
To John Myers, for two diplomatic trunks		16 00
To Peter Force, for publishing exequaturs		12 00
To George E. Ironside, for carrying despatches to Mr. Gallatin, New York		85 00
To John Myers, for a diplomatic trunk		6 00
To Peter Force, for publishing exequaturs		8 00
To Peter Force, for publishing commercial regulations of the Republic of Colombia		47 00
To Gales and Seaton, for pulishing exequaturs		16 00
To Peter Force, for publishing exequaturs		2 00
To W J. Stone, for a Legation seal and passports		71 00
To W. Brown for a diplomatic trunk		11 00
To J. Maury, Consul at Liverpool, for postage in England		75 55
To H. Niles, for 52 copies of the Weekly Register, vol. 30		135 50
To Thomas L. Thurston, carrying despatches to Mr. Laurence, N. York		85 00
To Peter Force, for publishing exequaturs		4 00
To Peter Force, for printing 30 copies of the treaty with the Federation of the Centre of America		30 00
To W. Brown, for two diplomatic trunks		30 00
To John Myers, for 2 do		29 00
To W. Brown, for 2 do		$26 00
To do for 2 do		26 00
To M. M. Cruikshank, for a port folio, with chenille, hullion, &c.		75 00
To J. P. Latruite, for 2 gold sword knots, for tassels for port folio		8 00

To J. Gales & Son, for publishing ordinances, &c. relative to St. Domingo Exiles - - - 350 00
To D. & J. M. Faust, for do do - - 350 00
To E. Charless, for do - - 350 00
To G. W. Robertson for do do - - 350 00
To Amos Kendall & Co. for do do - - 206 72
To Morgan, Ledge, & Fisher, for do - - 350 00
To Ether Shepley, for services in the case of the British schooner Hero 2 00

1827.

To John Mason, jr. bearer of despaches from Mexico to the Secretary of State, for the hire of a coach from Mexico to Vera Cruz 278
Daily expenses from Mexico to Vera Cruz, including 2 days detention at the latter place 78
Passage from Vera Cruz to Norfolk 150
Daily expenses from Norfolk to Washington 54
Per diem allowance from the 25th December, 1826, to 4th February, 1827, is 42 days, at 6 dollars per day 252
—— 812 00

Paid a courier a Jalopa to go to Vera Cruz to stop the ship - - - 57 00
To John B. March, Consul at Madeira, for maintenance in prison, clothing and boat hire to carry three American seamen to Lisbon for trial, charged with murder on board an American vessel, including a commission of 9 dollars and three cents - - - 189 63
To M. M Cruikshank, for a blue velvet port folio, embroidered, &c. for a treaty - - - 45 00
To William Wirt, for his services in the Circuit Court in the United States for Maryland district, in the case of the U. States against Goodling - - - - 500 00
To Peter Force, for publishing exequaturs - - - 32 00
To J.S. Simpson, for publishing notice St. Domingo claimants - - - 350 00
To Peter Force, for publishing exequaturs - - 18 00
To Gales and Seaton, for do do &c. - - 70 00
To F. Massi & Co. for gold trimmings for treaties - - - - - 42 50
To James Haig, for publishing notice to St. Domingo claimants - - - 148 61
To M. M. Cruikshank, for blue velvet port folio for treaty, embroidered with chenille, &c. - - - 75 00
To Peter Force, for publishing proclamation suspending intercourse, &c. - - 43 00
To do for 30 copies of the Convention of London, &c. and for 30 copies act for adjustment of claims - - 17 50
To H. Niles, for 152 copies of the Weekly Register, vol. 31 - - - 153 25
To F. Massi & Co. for two boxes for treaty seals - - 200 00
To Peter Force, for publishing exequaturs - - 12 00
To M. M. Cruikshank, for a port folio for a treaty - - - - - - 75 00
To W. Brown for a diplomatic trunk 8 00
To James Maury, Consul at Liverpool, for postages in England - 184 99
To Gales and Seaton, for publishing exequaturs, advertising, &c. 64 87
To W. P. Elliott, bearing despatches to London 100 00
To A. & H. Wilson, for advertising 15 00
To W. Brown for a diplomatic trunk 13 00
To R. S. Coxe, assignee, for passage of Wm. B. Hodgson from Port Mahon to Algiers 120 00
To W. Brown, for 2 diplomatic trunks 23 00
To Peter Force, for 25 sets National Calender, 5 vols. each, at $1 per volume 125 00
To Gales & Seaton, for sea letters and publishing exequaturs 21 00
To John Myers, for a diplomatic trunk 5 00
To G. & W. Robinson, for advertising 27 00
To I. G. Broughton, for ditto 10 00
To Ch. Goodrich, bearing despatches to Mr. Wheaton, New York 60 00
To I. W. Townsend, for advertising 24 00
To B. Russell, for do. 113 50
To Gales & Seaton, for one ream sea letters 28 00
To do. for exequaturs 15 00
To Peter Force for do. 17 00

To W. J. Stone, for printing Consuls' commissions, &c.
To Thomas Snowden, for advertising
To Cammoc & Ragland, for ditto
To do do for do
To do do for do
To Joseph Forrest, for making extracts from the Journal of the Commission under the Florida Treaty
To D. & J. M. Faust, for advertising in relation to the treaty of Ghent
To S. L. Dashiell, for copying 44,464 words, at 10 cents per hundred, and 5 maps in relation to the treaty of Ghent
To A. L. M'Intire, for copying 51,246 words, at 10 cents per hundred
To Edward Deeble, for copying 53,118 words at same
To A. H. Pemberton, for advertising
To I. Hughes, for do
To Nathan Low, for do
To Joseph Forrest, for copying 87,716 words, at 10 cents per 100
To Pleasants & Smith, for advertising
To A. L. M'Intire, for 3 days tracing maps in relation to the boundary
To Theodore W. Clay, bearer of despatches to Mexico, for his passage to New York, including one day's detention in Philadelphia $ 18 50
his passage to Vera Cruz 150 00
carriage hire and expenses to Mexico 126 50
carriage hire to Vera Cruz 75 00
expenses to do 23 25
his return passage to N. York 150 00
expenses from thence to Washington 20 25
his compensation from 17th March, the day of his departure from Washington, to the 2d July 1827, inclusive, the day of his return thither, making 107 days, at $6 per day 642 00 ——— 1,205 50
To James Davidson, for copying 52,416 words, at 10 cents per 100 52 42
To A. Ford, for 12 day's tracing maps
To S. L. Dashiell, for 13 days do 20 33
To A. Rentzal, for 16 days do 9 50
To William Phillips, bearer of despatches from Guatemala to the United States, for compensation from 9th April to 30th June, 1827, is 83 days, at $6 per pay, including 11 25
his expenses 4 50
32 50
To Gales & Seaton, for publishing exequaturs, &c. 9 00 775 25
To Samuel Hanson, for copying 73,346 words, at 10 cents per hundred $15 00
To S. L. Dashiell, for 5 days tracing maps
To W. G. Cranch, for copying 52,788 words, at 10 cents per hundred 54 46
To A. Ford, for 12 days tracing maps, at $2 per day
To A. Rentzel, for 14½ days do at do 53 12
To Ed. Taylor, for copying 107,587 words, at 10 cents per hundred 53 75
15 00
7 50
To S. McDonald, for copying 53,130 words, at 10 cents per hundred 87 72
To Helen Davis, for copying 87,609 words, at 10 cents per hundred 22 50
To A. L. McIntire, for tracing maps 32 days, at $2 6 00
To A. Rentzel, for do 7½ days, at do
To E. Deeble, for copying 120,900 words, at 10 cents per hundred
To A. Rentzel, for tracing maps 4 days, of 9 hours each day, at $3 per day
To A. Ford, for do. 12 days. 6 hours each day, at $2
To S. L. Dashiell, for 17 days at $2, and 6 days at $3
To James Coucheval, for part payment as bearer of despatches from Stockholm to Washington, and returning by way of London
To do. for his services in the Legation at Stockholm, in transcribing, &c.
To Lucy Baker, for copying 94,518 words, at 10 cents per hundred
To M. M. Cruikshank, for copying 81,624 words, at do
To Meade Fitzhugh, for do. 102,695 words, at do and 3 maps at $10

		land	200 00
To James Haig, for advertising			
	33 10	To M. M. Cruikshank, for copying 18,376 words, at 10 cents per 100	18 38
To A. Rentzel, for copying maps six days, at $3 per day			
	18 00	To S. D. King, for copying part of an old map of	
To S. L. Dashiell, for do. 3 days, at do		North America	9 50
To Thomas Munroe, for sundry articles of arms and equipments of an American soldier, transmitted through Thomas Munroe, jr. to the Archduke Constantine, and certain Russian and Polish Officers		Dollars,	16,304 92 19,759 39
To A. Rentzel, for copying maps five days, at $3 per day		TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *Register's Office, Feb. 28, 1828.*	JOS. NOURSE, *Reg'r.*
To A. L. McIntire, for do 17 days at do			
To A. Ramsay, jr. for copying 35,752 words, at 10 cents per hundred		STATEMENT explaining the differences between the "Statement showing the disbursements made out of the appropriations for the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse, distinguishing between those items which have been allowed under the authority, and upon the certificate of the Secretary of State, from those which have been otherwise vouched, from 4th March, 1825, to the 31st December, 1827," (marked B.) and the actual amount of payments made from the Treasury during the years 1825, 1826, and 1827, (as per statement A.)	
To James Ord, for copying 95,040 do at do			
To A. Ford, for tracing maps 22 days, at $2 per day			
To R Patton, for copying 52,500 words, at 10 cts. per hundred			
To W. B. Page, for do. 120,960 words, at do.			
To Jonathan Elliot, for 100 copies Treaties and Conventions			
To Gales & Seaton, for advertising exequaturs, &c.			
To James Maury, Consul at Liverpool, for postages in England			
To James Martin, for copying 91,687 words, at 10 cents per hundred			
To Dobbin, Murphy & Bose, for advertising			
To James Ord, for 3½ days' examining records in relation to Treaty of Ghent, at $2 50 per day			
To Ballard & Wright for advertising			
To A. L. McIntire, for 3½ days examining record in relation to Treaty at Ghent, at $2 50 per day			
To B. Russel, for advertising			
To Edward Wyer, bearer of depatches to London, for his compensation from 28th Dec. 1820, to the 19th March, 1827, making 82 days, at $6 per day, including passages and expenses	1,267 00		
To W. Prentiss, for his compensation and expenses in delivering a box of books to the Governor of Maine, at Port-			

	44 09	Expenditures, (as per statement B) from 4th March, to 31st December, 1825,	$11,828 81
	52 50	To which add the following expenditures, from the 1st January, to 3d March, 1825, viz:	
	120 96	Andrew Armstrong, Commercial Agent at Port au Prince, (salary,)	250 00
	1,000 00	Daniel Turner, bearer of despathes from Montevideo to Buenos Ayres,	150 00
	46 00	William Taylor, Agent of the United States at Alvarado,	500 00
	164 59	Condy Raguet, Agent for Commerce and Seamen Rio Janeiro,	2,500 00
	91 69	John B. Prevost, Agent of the United States in South America,	500 00
	135 00	Wolcott Chauncey, for passage of Edward Wyer, and Consul Stith, and family, in the years 1821 and 1822,	1,150 00
	8 33	Joseph Milligan, for a port folio, for a treaty,	100 00
	116 25	President's certificate, without specification,	700 00
	8 33	Do. do.	1,000 00
	6 00		6,850 00
		And Expenditures from March 4, to Dec. 1825, viz:	
		Andrew Armstrong, Commercial Agent at Port au Prince, (salary,)	750 00
		John B. Prevost, Agent of the United States in South America,	2,000 00
		Condy Raguet, Agent for Commerce and Seamen, at Rio Janeiro.	400 00

†Richard C. Anderson, jr. late Minister at Colombia, for writing done for the Legation of the United States at Bogota, from 10th December, 1823, to 2d Jan. 1825,	2,125 24	
*John J. Appleton, Special Agent at Naples,	1,125 00	
‡John M. Forbes Charge des Affaires at Buenos Ayres, for the funeral expenses of Cæsar A. Rodney, deceased, late Minister at Buenos Ayres,	471 12	
		13,721 36
To which add the following:		
For this sum paid to George S. Watkins, more than accounted for by him	186 07	
And this sum advanced to John H. Pleasants, more than accounted for by him in this year; both repaid in 1827	10 00	196 07
		25,746 26
From which deduct the following:		
Balance due by the Agent the Department of State, on 1st January, 1825,	218 38	
Balance due to the Agent of the Department of State, on 1st January, 1826,	44 80	173 58
Total payments made from the Treasury in the year 1825,		$25,572 68
Expenditures (as per Statement B.) for 1826.		12,656 04
To which add the following expenditures for 1826, viz:		
James Bowdoin, formerly Minister at Madrid, for balance due to him	86 31	
Andrew Armstrong, Commercial Agent at Port au Prince, salary	1,000 00	
President's Certificate, without specification,	1,666 66	
		2,752 97
Add, also—		
Balance due from the Agent on the 1st January, 1827,	3,268 79	
Balance due to the Agent on the 1st January, 1826	44 80	3,223 99
Total payments made from the Treasury in the year 1826,		$18,633 00
Expenditures (as per Statement B.) for 1827.		11,579 44
To which, add the following expenditures for 1827, viz:		
Andrew Armstrong, Commercial Agent at Port au Prince, (salary.)	750 00	
*John Rainals, Consul at Copenhagen,	500 00	
‡William Tudor, Consul at Lima,	9,800 00	
‡Robert M. Harrison, Consul at Trinidad,	875 00	
Vincent Gray, for amount paid by him at Havana, for the relief of sundry American citizens confined there in prison, in 1815,	1,275 00	
President's certificate, without specification,	967 38	
Do. do.	979 78	
Do. do.	1,052 90	
Do. do.	4,456 00	
Do. do.	1,500 00	
		22,158 06
Add, also:		
Balance due from the Agent, on the 1st January, 1828,	5,789 97	
Balance due from the Agent, on the 1st January, 1827,	3,268 79	
		2,521 18
Total payments made from the Treasury, in the year 1827,		$36,258 63

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Register's Office, March 22, 1828.
JOSEPH NOURSE, *Register.*

*Advances—accounts unsettled.
†Allowed by the President.
‡ do. Ex-President Monroe.

Economy—We do not profess to belong to that class of politicians, who feel, or pretend to feel, a desire to be economical at the expense of public good—on the contrary, we desire to see liberality governed by prudence, and expenditures controled by necessity. Nevertheless, when wanton extravagance, and waste of public money are sanctioned by the administration, the sooner the people change their public servants, the better it will be for the coffers of the nation. We have before us the report of the committee on the expenditures of the department of state, in which there are some items which would make a republican cabinet blush, *viz*:—

"Maurice Furst for a *gold medal of John Quincy Adams*, $100.

Now the sum of $100, it is true, is not of much consequence, but it is the principle it involves. For what public use, or benefit, is this gold medal of Mr. Adams', intended? who is to wear it? Is it Mr. Clay? we think he has weight enough of the original around his neck. Where is the appropriation, by Congress, for this gold medal? If you give away $100 of the public money, for a gold medal of the President, there is nothing to prevent the payment of a pension to him, and allowance to his eldest son. To the next—

Do. M. M. Cruickshank, for blue velvet, port folio, embroidered with chenille(with gold tassels)$100.

Monstrous! $100 for a port folio, when a neat morocco one, in a plain republican style, may be had for $10, which would answer the pur-

pose—besides, where is the appropriation, or who is it for? Probably it is the identical golden port folio, in which Prince John carries the messages to both Houses of Congress.

Cash paid Richard Rush, for sundry books and newspapers, procured by him in London, $799 98.

Nearly 800 dollars for *foreign* newspapers without reference to the sum to newspapers at home, which print by "authority" For whose use were these newspapers imported, and where is the appropriation?

Do. to Robert Ellis *for Lives and Portraits of eminent Englishmen!* $40.

Has not President Adams given sufficient proof of his attachment to eminent Englishmen without making the freemen of this country pay the expense? Is this a proper expenditure of public money?

Do. W. A. Davis, 16 reams ENGLISH laid 4to post paper, gilt, at 9 dollars per ream, $144.

Well done *American System.* Mr. Clay, who calls himself the father, or he should rather say the *step* father of this system, expending 144 dollars of the people's money for *English* writing paper. We know the reason, however; for though American hot pressed letter paper is equally as good as English, yet it has no little stamp of a *crown* on the corner of the quire.

Do. G. Gaither for a dozen *Silver Pens*, $2 50.

Silver Pens—vanitas vanitatum—or as some ill-natured Latinists would say, Ebony and Topaz. Mr. Adams wears a thimble when he writes, and probably requires some equally hard substance in the composition of his pens, but why a *dozen* silver pens, if plain continental goose quills would not answer, one silver pen might do.

Do. G. B. Ironside, for a *platina* pen. $6.

Just now a whole dozen silver pens cost but $2 50; but as silver was cheap and plenty in Washington, (which is not the case in wall-street) something more costly must be sought for, or the people's money would continue to rust in the coffers.

Do. Davis & Force, for printing 50 copies *Directions for Minister's dress*, $2 50.

Shades of Benj. Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Roger Sherman, Patrick Henry and other venerable patriots, who founded our Republic—what would you say, could you be familiar with such expenditures, in the 50th year of American Independence? Bonaparte, amidst the splendour of his Court, took pleasure in singling out Chancellor Livingston, and always conversed with him, though he wore a snuff-colored coat; but, to make people pay for directions for such trash, or indeed to meddle with a Minister's coat and breeches, is contemptible, and beneath the character of a free and enlightened people.

Do. W. Slade, for hearing *despatches* to New-York, $100.

This is an impudent charge, to say the least of it. It is true, that political partizans have had a few newspapers tied up and sent to foreign Courts, as despatches, and they have received 1000, 1500, and 1900 dollars, for expenses, but to send a dispatch messenger to New-York, when a daily mail runs from Washington, is a shameful expense. We can inform them, however, that the person who received 100 dollars for carrying despatches to N. York, actually carried them to Vermont, to which place he was sent on an electioneering mission

We must lay by the black book for the present, with the simple remark, that extravagance and impudent waste of public money, are sanctioned at Washington, while the remnant of our revolutionary officers, are in vain praying for the pittance which is due to them—and we are daily losing sight of that simplicity and economy, which should characterise a Republican Government.—*N. Y. Erq.*

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Certain newspapers in the service of the *administration*, are giving Mr. Adams credit for great financial skill in the reduction of the public debt His Secretary of the Treasury, in his last annual report, has so stated the account as to lead some honest, well meaning men to believe that, $21,297 210 93 of the principal of the debt was discharged between the 1st of January, 1825 and the 1st of January 1828; when in truth, but $16,297,210 93 was paid within that period. Under the act of 26th May 1824, five millions of dollars were borrowed by the Government at 4½ per cent interest, to redeem a like sum standing at 6 per cent. These five millions are, by Mr. Rush, added to the $16,297,210 93, actually paid, with which they had no natural connection; thus making the gross sum of $21,297,210 93 on the credit side; and then to balance the account, these five millions are charged on the debit side as so much new debt.

Whether this was awkwardness or design on the part of the Secretary, is not material to enquire; certain it is that many honest people have been misled by it; and some of their idolatrous Editors, no doubt, believe that Mr. Adams, by his wonderful learning and talents, has discovered the Philosopher's stone, by which he can not only convert wine into *Ebony* and *Topaz*, but the leaden brain of his Secretary into pure gold. The truth is that in the three years of Mr. Adams' administration, there has not been as much of the public debt paid by $13,702,789, as was required by law. That this sum is now due to the sinking fund, the Editors of the National Intelligencer must know; and yet they have copied into their paper of the 29th ult. a silly article from the Marylander, stating that, by July next, Mr. Adams will have paid more than thirty eight millions of the public debt, and therefore, recommending him, in the strongest terms of panegyric, for President again. Call you this honesty and fair dealing gentlemen? It is but little better than the spurious documents concerning the six militia men, now advertised in your paper for sale by Jonathan Elliott, or the coffin hand bills. Like those disgraceful documents, when properly understood, this pitiful trick will serve to swell the vote of Gen. Jackson a few thousand more; that's all.

This paper is published as a newspaper, and subject to newspaper postage and no more.—Some Postmasters have charged postage on it as a pamphlet; this is not correct, and all our subscribers are informed that we have submitted the question to the Postmaster General, who considers it within the decision made in the case of "Niles' Register."

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*; subject to newspaper postage, and *no more*.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, MAY 10, 1828. No. 10.

REPLY

By the Jackson Corresponding Committee of the District of Columbia, to Mr. Clay's last address.

To the People of the United States.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

In fulfilment of the intention, heretofore announced by this Committee, we now proceed to lay before you a reply to the late address of Mr. Clay. This reply would have been made at a much earlier period, but for the delay unavoidably incident to the procurement of the testimony of distant and dispersed witnesses, and other causes of a similar nature. The Committee have no reason, however, to regret the delay which has taken place, inasmuch as it has enabled them to exhibit an array of testimony, which goes to establish, beyond the possibility of a rational doubt, the charge of a corrupt political bargain between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay.

It is very far from our wish to cover any man, public or private, with undeserved reproach. On the contrary, it should be the pride, as it is the duty of every patriot, to protect our public men from causeless attacks, and rescue them from unfounded accusations. But there is a duty superior to the pride of national renown. When men whom the people have delighted to honor, disregard and forget their obligations to their country and themselves, endeavor to sap the foundations of our free institutions, and destroy the family which has given them power and distinction, it would be treason to our principles, our country, and ourselves, not to expose their machinations, and disarm them of power. National character without liberty, is not worth possessing. It should be our boast to maintain both. To that end, it becomes us to expose the mazes of intrigue, and visit with exemplary punishment, every violation of the rights of freemen, and every attempt, whether by force, management, or corruption, to concentrate in one or a few men, those powers which belong to the people. By promptitude and firmness in inflicting justice upon political offenders, we shall not only deter others from the perpetration of like enormities, but establish for ourselves, among the nations of the earth, an exalted national character, as merited as it will be enduring.

For Mr. Clay, we ask only that justice which he invokes. If he has not, in the aspirations of an unregulated ambition, abandoned the liberal principles which were once his boast; if he has not, to secure his own aggrandizement, disobeyed the voice of his country; if he has not, as the means of securing his own elevation, induced others to forget their duty; if he has not sought to shut his ears to the voice of the people, and when forced to hear, treated it with contempt; if he has not leagued with his personal and political enemy to divide the offices and emoluments of the government between them, by a mutual sacrifice of personal antipathies and political principles; if he has not used the power and patronage of office, to bend an unwilling people into reluctant acquiescence in his political arrangements; if he has not been guilty of most, if not all of these, then may he be a much injured man, still deserving of popular regard and general commiseration. It is a firm conviction, founded on the evidence before us, that Mr. Clay *is guilty*, and that, to suffer him to escape with impunity, would be unjust, would tempt other politicians to seek elevation by similar means, and ultimately change our pure elective system of government into one of wide spread profligacy and corruption, which induces us to attempt his detection and exposure.

The very title page of Mr. Clay's Address, is a specimen of the disingenuousness by which his whole course has lately been distinguished. It is entitled "An Address of Henry Clay to the public, containing certain testimony in refutation of the charges against him, *made by Gen. Andrew Jackson*, touching the late Presidential election." The charges embraced in the Address, are, that of making a proposition to General Jackson to make him President on condition that he would not make Mr. Adams Secretary of State, and that of voting for Mr. Adams on condition that he should be made Secretary of State himself.

The only ground on which General Jackson is accused of making the first charge, is the statement made by the General of the conversation which took

place between him and Mr. Buchanan, and the inference which he drew, that this gentleman had come authorized by Mr. Clay. By the statement of Mr. Buchanan, it appeared that the conversation took place, in substance, as General Jackson had stated. General Jackson had admitted, that in this inference he might be mistaken, and might have done injustice to Mr. Clay. When Mr. Buchanan disavowed having come by the authority of Mr. Clay, there seemed to be an end to this matter, which made the array of negative testimony produced by Mr. Clay, wholly unnecessary and gratuitous. General Jackson had stated that he might be mistaken. There ended the first charge, so far as General Jackson was concerned.

To implicate General Jackson in making the second charge, Mr. Clay's reasoning is as illogical as his object is unjust and disingenuous. The charge originated in thousands of minds, and flowed from thousands of tongues, the moment that Mr. Clay's determination to vote for Mr. Adams became publicly known. Mr. Kremer's letter to the Columbian Observer, making the charge in the broadest terms, was dated on the 25th of January, 1825, and was published on the 28th. Mr. Clay, on the 31st, in his card, pronounced the writer "a base and infamous calumniator, a dastard and a liar," and promised to hold him responsible "to all the laws which govern and regulate the conduct of men of honor." Mr. Kremer, in "another card," dated 3d February, declared himself "ready to prove, to the satisfaction of unprejudiced minds, enough to satisfy them of the accuracy of the statements which are contained in that letter, to the extent that they concern the course and conduct of "H. Clay." The first movement of Mr. Clay, was intended, by its violence and menaces, to deter every man from making charges against him, through fear of being held "responsible to the laws of honor." Mr. Kremer's card suggested to him another course, no less artful. The Presidential election had not yet taken place. His vote had not been given; the consideration of the bargain—the appointment of Secretary, had not been paid; and, in the absence of these facts, it was difficult, if not impossible, to prove motives and intentions; or, if strong circumstantial evidence could be adduced, it was still in the power of Mr. Clay to impress the community with the belief, that the evidence as well as the statement of Mr. Kremer, was founded in misapprehension, by refusing to accept the appointment of Secretary of State. Instead of challenging Mr. Kremer, according to the laws of honor, he therefore appealed to the House of Representatives, and solicited an investigation. Mr. Kremer avowed his readiness to meet it, and prove the charges, *as made in the letter*. By rejecting the proposition made by Mr. M'Duffie, the House refused to receive evidence corresponding with the charge, and Mr. Kremer not being able to produce it in any other shape, prudently abandoned the attempt, and left the parties to complete their arrangements. This failure to prove him guilty before the offence was committed, Mr. Clay has, with his usual art, ever since claimed as an acquittal!

It does not appear that General Jackson ever mentioned his interview with Mr. Buchanan, at Washington City; but the latter gentleman, in his public statement, admits that he had frequently mentioned it himself. But Mr. Clay, for purposes which cannot be mistaken, chooses, without a shadow of evidence, to attribute that to General Jackson, which he knows came from Mr. Buchanan. It is only by following the General in his journeys, some time after the Presidential election, and catching at garbled statements of remarks as made by him in casual conversations, and by searching his own domicil, that expressions of disapprobation have been detected in relation to that, which had before raised the voices of indignant millions. There is scarcely a man in the Union opposed to the re-election of Mr. Adams, upon whom stronger expressions in relation to the late Presidential election might not be proved, than those which Mr. Clay, with all the devotion of his willing instruments, has been able to fix on Gen. Jackson.

Mr. Clay mistakes his accuser. It is a NATION which has arraigned him at its bar. The charge of corruption in the last Presidential election, has been made by an insulted people. The evidence of its truth has been accumulating from the moment of its origin. To escape from its fatal influence, Mr. Clay turns to the right and the left, grasps at every expedient, and seeks a personal quarrel with General Jackson. It is all in vain. The fatal charge sticks to him like the poisoned shirt of Nessus, and every reckless effort

of his agony, but fixes it more closely, and makes his destruction more certain.

The late Address is but another evolution of Mr. Clay's political tactics, to deceive the people, and draw off their attention from the only important question now in issue. Neither his menaces nor his arts, nor his letter to Judge Brooke, nor his address to his constituents, nor his Lewisburg speech, nor his Pittsburg speech, could arrest the torrent of public reproach, and retrieve the sinking fortunes of the Coalition. The Fayetteville letter suggested a new expedient. It was to avert public attention from his bargain with Mr. Adams, by seeking a contest with General Jackson, upon a collateral issue. On his journey to the West, last summer, he learnt at Wheeling, that there was in town a private letter from General Jackson, detailing the incidents alluded to in that letter. Of this private letter, he procured a copy, without the consent of the writer or receiver. Gen. Jackson had drawn the inference, that the member of Congress alluded to had been authorized by Mr. Clay, directly or indirectly, to hold the conversation which he recapitulated, although he admitted that in this he might be mistaken. Mr. Clay determined on a tremendous effort to make the whole controversy in the public mind rest on the correctness of General Jackson's inference. He therefore published the private letter of General Jackson, denied the inference, charged General Jackson with becoming his public accuser, and followed it up with speech upon speech, at Noble's, in Woodford county, at Paris, and at Maysville, filled with denunciation and violence. General Jackson calmly replied, and gave the name of the member of Congress with whom he had held the conversation, and again admitted that his inference might be unfounded. Mr. Buchanan stated that it was. Instantly the Union rang with Mr. Clay's acquittal. His friends every where maintained, that the absence of evidence that he had made a proposition to *General Jackson*, was conclusive proof that he had made no bargain with *Mr. Adams!* The art of Mr. Clay measurably succeeded, and for a time the public attention was withdrawn from the important point in controversy—HIS COALITION WITH MR. ADAMS.

But new facts and new evidence had been disclosed. The public attention was again fixing itself upon the point in issue. To divert it once more, Mr. Clay came out with his late Address, still assailing General Jackson, making new charges against him, and casting an anchor ahead to guard against a storm which he saw approaching from the West. In all his defences, hitherto, he had conveyed the impression that he had made up his mind to vote for Mr. Adams with great deliberation, after he had ceased to be a candidate, and was converted into an elector. The public knew not of his determination until about the 20th of January, 1825, and consequently, had drawn the inference, that he had not formed it many days before that time. But facts disclosed in the Western papers, were leading to the conclusion, that his coalition with Mr. Adams was privately formed long before, and to weaken the effect of this new evidence before it should come fairly before the people, the Secretary, with his usual adroitness, undertakes to prove that he made up his mind to vote for Mr. Adams, as early as October, 1824! In the course of this investigation, it will be seen what advantage will accrue to his *veracity*, his *integrity*, or his *honor*, by the new ground he has thus lately assumed before the American people.

Without further adverting to the arts of the Secretary to divert and deceive the public attention, we shall now proceed to consider the only material point in issue between the people on one side, and Messrs. Adams and Clay on the other. *Did Mr. Clay support Mr. Adams with his vote and influence in consideration of being made Secretary of State, as the price or the consequence of his support?*

To judge of the inducement which brought these men together, it is necessary to understand their previous relations. For the honor of our country, we could wish that the facts we are about to disclose, had never existed. Nothing but our obligations as freemen, who view the intrigues of unprincipled politicians as more dangerous to our country than the enemies whom Jackson conquered, would draw from us the mortifying detail which it is now our duty to lay before the American people.

At the period of the treaty of Ghent, John Quincy Adams was considered the most eminent public man in the East, and Henry Clay, in the West. The race of Virginia Presidents was almost extinct. Mr. Monroe was the Secretary of State, and the destined successor of Mr. Madison. It was universally foreseen, that, at the termination of Mr. Monroe's service as President, the sceptre of authority would be transferred to some other section

of the Union. Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay, the prominent men of the East and the West, both desired to obtain the appointment of Secretary of State to Mr. Monroe, that they might succeed him as President.

In the negotiation at Ghent, a difference arose among the Commissioners, relative to an offer proposed to be made to the British Commissioners, of the free navigation of the Mississippi by British subjects, as an equivalent for the privilege of fishing within the territorial jurisdiction of Great Britain on the coasts of North America. Messrs. Adams, Bayard, and Gallatin, were in favor of making the offer, and Messrs. Clay and Russell against it. In a joint letter from the American Commissioners to their Government, dated at Ghent, Dec. 25th, 1814, is the following passage:

"If they, (the British Commissioners,) asked the navigation of the Mississippi as a new claim, they could not expect we should grant it without an equivalent; if they asked it because it was granted in 1783, they must recognise the claim of the people of the United States to the liberty to fish, and to dry and cure fish, in question. To place both points beyond all future controversy, *a majority of us determined to offer* to admit an article confirming both rights; or, we offered at the same time to be silent in the treaty upon both; and to leave out, altogether, the article defining the boundary from the Lake of the Woods westward."

How the expression, "a majority of us," &c. came to be in the letter, is thus explained by Mr. Adams in his book upon the Mississippi and the fisheries, page 159:

"The draught having been passed round to all the members of the mission for revisal, was brought back to me by Mr. Russell, with an alteration, which, he said, was desired, not by him, but by Mr. Clay, to say, instead of "we offered," "a majority of us determined to offer."

The very same day, Mr. Russell, *who had not desired* the alteration himself, wrote a separate letter to the Secretary of State, in which he said:

"As, however, you will perceive by our despatch to you of this date, that a *majority* only of the mission was in favor of offering to the British plenipotentiaries, an article confirming the British right to the navigation of the Mississippi, and ours to the liberty as to the fisheries, it becomes me in candor to acknowledge, that I was in the minority on that question. I must reserve to myself the power of communicating to you, hereafter, the reasons which influenced me to differ from a majority of my colleagues on that occasion; and if they be insufficient to support my opinion, I persuade myself that they will, at least, vindicate my motives."

It was very singular, that Mr. Russell, who did not even desire that the alteration should be made in the joint letter, specifying that a majority only concurred in the offer of the Mississippi navigation, should have so far changed his mind on the same day, as to deem it necessary for him, in vindication of his motives, to give an explanation to his government. Nobody had denounced his motives, and the Secretary of State would never have known that he was one of the minority, had he not announced it himself. It is evident, therefore, that he must have had a motive in this transaction, distinct from self-vindication.

In accordance with his notice, Mr. Russell wrote a long letter to Mr. Monroe, then Secretary of State, dated at Paris, Feb. 11th, 1815, marked "private." In this letter he magnified the importance of the Mississippi navigation to the British, depreciated the value to us, of the fisheries in controversy, became the champion of western interests, and charged the majority with insincerity, absurdity, and violation of instructions. It was a formal argument and studied commentary upon the joint letter of Dec. 25th, 1814, which had been penned by Mr. Adams. Being marked '*private*,' it was intended only for the inspection of Mr. Monroe. Mr. Russell first makes an occasion for this explanation by gratuitously informing Mr. Monroe, that he was in the minority, and then gravely proceeds to give it! Unassailed, except by himself, he enters into a formal vindication. This is addressed, not to the people nor to the public authorities of his country, but to him who is destined to be the next President. Mr. Monroe had always distinguished himself as the friend of the west, and any thing which threatened to injure that favorite section of the Union, was calculated to sink deep into his mind. Nor could it be supposed, that the impression would be less effective, because the disclosure came from a northern man, who seemed to have no interest in exaggeration or misrepresentation.

Mr. Clay and Mr. Russell acted together, and voted together. At Mr. Clay's suggestion, Mr. Russell procured the alteration in the joint letter. *They were togeth-*

er at Paris when the explanation was written. If this document had impaired the confidence of Mr. Monroe in Mr. Adams as one of the majority, who was to be benefited? Not Mr. Russell; for he could not expect the office of Secretary of State from Mr. Monroe. No man was as likely to reap the benefits as Mr. Clay. Delivered from the rivalry of Mr. Adams, he would have had a brighter prospect for the office of Secretary of State, that sure path to the summit of his ambitious hopes. The interest of Mr. Russell could have been only contingent upon the downfall of Mr. Adams and the elevation of Mr. Clay. There can, therefore, be but little doubt, that this whole affair was an intrigue set on foot by Mr. Clay, to undermine Mr. Adams in the estimation of Mr. Monroe, and open to himself an avenue to the second office in the government.

The intrigue failed. Russell's letter was filed away unheeded, among Mr. Monroe's private papers; he is made President, and appoints Mr. Adams Secretary of State. From that moment Mr. Clay was opposed to Mr. Monroe, and sought every occasion to thwart the measures of his administration.

That this whole affair was a piece of management in Mr. Clay, to destroy Mr. Adams, and that the latter thought so, is proved by subsequent events. In the first page of the introduction to his book upon the Mississippi, Mr. Adams says:

"In the course of last summer, (of 1821) I was apprized by a friend, that rumors very unfavorable to my reputation, even for integrity, were industriously circulated in the western country. That it was said I had made a proposition at Ghent to grant to the British the right to navigate the Mississippi, in return for the Newfoundland fisheries, and that this was represented as, at least, a high misdemeanor." "He said, the proposal was twice represented (as an offence) so that it was charged exclusively upon me; and that I should hear more about it ere long."

On the succeeding January, the documents relative to the Ghent negotiation were called for, and in February laid before the House of Representatives. Mr. Adams says, that while these documents were lying on the table, "the correspondence from Washington, and the newspapers indoctrinated by it, had not been equally inactive. Through these channels, the public were assured, that the proposal of offering the navigation of the Mississippi for the fisheries had been made by me; that Mr. Clay had uniformly declared that he would not sign the treaty with such an article in it; and that the proposal had been finally set aside by Mr. Bayard's having changed sides, and come over to the opinion of the minority."

In April, 1822, a call was made for Mr. Russell's private letter, dated at Paris, Feb. 11th, 1815, which was repeated in the following June. On the latter occasion, Mr. B. Hardin, of Kentucky, is reported in the National Intelligencer, to have said, "he was glad the letter was called for, and he should vote for the resolution, as it would show the western people in what manner their interests were disregarded or sacrificed: that the Commissioners offered to give up the navigation of the Mississippi, to secure the fisheries of the east."

There now came out the original letter to Mr. Monroe, marked "*private*," together with a "duplicate" left by Mr. Russell at the Department of State, before the original was found, to be communicated to the House. Mr. Adams obtained leave to submit his remarks upon these documents, and laying hold of certain differences between the letter and the duplicate, to assail Mr. Russell, did not hesitate now and then to aim a thrust at Mr. Clay, whom he evidently believed to be the original mover. Of Mr. Clay and Mr. Russell, he says, page 11:

"That the objection, by the minority, against the article and amendment, insisted, in principle, upon the sacrifice of an eastern for the benefit of a western interest.

"That the eastern interest to be sacrificed, was of very great importance to the Union, and of vital importance to the State of Massachusetts; while the western interest for which it was to be immolated, was altogether speculative and imaginary. It was most truly denominated by the member of the mission now no more, *bragging a million against a cent.*"

These views are enforced throughout the publication of Mr. Adams, intermingled with insinuations against the conduct and motives of Mr. Clay; with insinuations that the whole affair, from the alteration in the joint letter at Ghent, to the call for Mr. Russell's private letter in Congress, was a scheme of intrigue to destroy his reputation and effect his ruin. In productions written by him some time after the publication of Mr. Russell's letters with his remarks, he repeats the same views. In his book, page 232, he says:

"Since the communication of his (Mr.

Russell's letters to the House of Representatives, the uses for which it was supposed the production of them was intended, and to which they were adapted, have not been altogether abandoned in some parts of the western country. The St. Louis Enquirer, has pursued this purpose in the simplest form, by publishing the message of the President of the United States to the House of Representatives, of the 7th May, and Mr. Russell's private letter, and by suppressing the duplicate and the remarks. In the Kentucky Reporter, published in Lexington, and in the Argus of Western America, published in Frankfort, various publications have appeared, exhibiting similar views of the subject, representing the proposition made to the British plenipotentiaries on the 1st December, 1814, as a very grievous offence, & ascribing it exclusively to me."

In page 254, he further says: "The perusal of Mr. Russell's duplicate, disclosed to me the mystery of ruin which had been brewing against me, from the very day after the signature of the treaty of Ghent. It was by representations like those of that letter, that the minds of my fellow-citizens in the west, had for a succession of years been abused and ulcerated against me. That letter, indeed, inculpated the whole majority of the mission of Ghent; but subsidiary slander had performed its part of pointing all the guilt, and fastening all the responsibility of the crime upon me."

The allusions to Mr. Clay, and the imputations cast on him by Mr. Adams, were too obvious and too severe to pass without notice. Mr. Clay became sensible, that it was due to his integrity and honor, to appear before the public. Had not the alterations in his duplicate, rendered Mr. Russell unpopular, there is little doubt that he would have been backed and sustained by all Mr. Clay's weight and influence. As it was, that gentleman was glad to escape from the contest. The introduction to Mr. Adams' book was dated Sept. 21st, 1822. On the 16th November, Mr. Clay addressed to the editors of the National Intelligencer, the following letter:

LEXINGTON, 16th Nov. 1822.

"GENTLEMEN—I have witnessed, with very great regret, the unhappy controversy which has arisen between two of my late colleagues at Ghent. In the course of the several publications of which it has been the occasion, and particularly in the appendix to a pamphlet, which has been recently published by the honorable John Quincy Adams, I think there are some errors, (no doubt unintentional,) both as to matters of fact and matters of opinion, in regard to the transactions at Ghent, relating to the navigation of the Mississippi, and certain liberties claimed by the United States in the fisheries, and to the part which I bore in those transactions. These important interests are now well secured, and, as it respects that of the navigation of the Mississippi left as it ought to be, on the same firm footing with the navigation of all other rivers of the confederacy, the hope may be confidently cherished, that it never will hereafter be deemed a fit subject of negotiation with any foreign power. An account, therefore, of what occurred in the negotiations at Ghent, on these two subjects, is not perhaps necessary to the present or future security of any of the rights of the nation, and is only interesting as appertaining to its past history. With these impressions, and being extremely unwilling to present myself, at any time, before the public, I had almost resolved to remain silent, and thus expose myself to the inference of an acquiescence in the correctness of all the statements made by both my colleagues; but I have, on more reflection, thought, that it may be expected of me, and be considered as a duty on my part, to contribute all in my power towards a full and faithful understanding of the transactions referred to. Under this conviction, I will, at some time more propitious than the present, to calm and dispassionate consideration, and when there can be no misinterpretation of motives, lay before the public a narrative of those transactions as I understood them. I will not, at this time, be even provoked (it would, at any time be inexpressibly painful to me, to find it necessary) to enter the field of disputation with either of my late colleagues.

"As to that part of the official correspondence at Ghent, which had not been communicated to the public by the President of the United States, prior to the last session of Congress, I certainly knew of no public considerations, requiring it to be withheld from general inspection. But I had no knowledge of the intention of the honorable Mr. Floyd, to call for it, nor of the call itself, through the House of Representatives, until I saw it announced in the public prints. Nor had I any knowledge of the subsequent call which was made for the letter of the honorable Mr. Russell, or the intention to make it until I derived it from the same channel.

"I will thank you to publish this note in

the National Intelligencer, and to accept assurances of the high respect of your obedient servant, H. CLAY."

The next day the following reply appeared in the same paper:

To the Editors of the National Intelligencer.

"GENTLEMEN—In your paper of yesterday I have observed a note from Mr. Henry Clay, which requires some notice from me.

"After expressing the regret of the writer at the unhappy controversy which has arisen between two of his late colleagues at Ghent, it proceeds to say, that in the course of the several publications of which it has been the occasion, and particularly in the appendix to the pamphlet recently published by me, "he thinks there are some errors, (no doubt unintentional,) both as to matters of fact and matters of opinion, in regard to the transactions at Ghent relating to the navigation of the Mississippi, and certain liberties claimed by the United States in the fisheries, and to the part which he bore in those transactions."

"Concurring with Mr. Clay in the regret that the controversy should ever have arisen, I have only to find consolation in the reflection, that from the seed time of 1814 to the harvest of 1822, the contest was never of my seeking, and that since I have been drawn into it, whatever I have said, written, or done in it, has been in the face of day, and under the responsibility of my name.

"Had Mr. Clay thought it advisable, now to specify any error of fact or of imputed opinion which he thinks contained in the appendix to my pamphlet, or in any other part of my share in the publication, it would have given me great pleasure to rectify, by candid acknowledgment, any such error, of which, by the light that he would have shed on the subject, I should have been convinced. At whatever period hereafter, he shall deem the accepted time has come, to publish his promised narrative, I shall, if yet living, be ready with equal cheerfulness, to acknowledge indicated error, and to vindicate contested truth.

"But, as by the adjournment of that publication to a period "more propitious than the present to calm and dispassionate consideration, and when there can be no misintrpretation of motives," it may chance to be postponed, until both of us shall have been summoned to account for all our errors, before a higher tribunal than that of our country, I feel myself now called upon to say, that let the appropriate dispositions, when and how they will, expose the open day and secret night of the transactions at Ghent, the statements both of fact and opinion in the papers which I have written and published, in relation to this controversy, will, in every particular, essential or important to the interests of the nation, or to the character of Mr. Clay, be found to abide unshaken, the test of human scrutiny, of talents, and of time.

"JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

WASHINGTON, 18th Dec. 1822."

It will be seen that Mr. Adams not only re-asserts all he had said in relation to Mr. Clay, but mysteriously hints at 'secret night' transactions at Ghent, and broadly insinuates, that Mr. Clay had covertly assailed him, without daring to incur the responsibility of putting his name to his accusations. Nothing in Mr. Clay's letter to the Editors of the National Intelligencer, could have excited those dark suspicions, or justified their publication. Mr. Clay said: "I have witnessed, with very great regret, the unhappy controversy which has arisen between two of my late colleagues at Ghent." He does not even censure Mr. Adams, but simply thinks he has committed "some errors, (no doubt unintentional,) both as to matters of fact and matters of opinion," &c. He seems to think the whole matter of very little importance, and says: "I will not, at this time, be even provoked (it would at any time be inexpressibly painful to me to find it necessary) to enter the field of disputation with either of my late colleagues." This has the appearance of uncommon forbearance and magnanimity.

In one point Mr. Clay was doubtless sincere. It would have been 'inexpressibly painful' to him to enter the field of disputation with Mr. Adams, as the co-adjutor of Jonathan Russell. But in every other respect, we are compelled to say, as Mr. Adams insinuated, that there never was a more perfect specimen of profound hypocrisy and dissimulation, than was exhibited by Mr. Clay, in this letter to the Editors of the National Intelligencer. At that very moment, the western papers were teeming with the most injurious charges against Mr. Adams, instigated by Mr. Clay's own tongue, or coming from his own hand!

During the late investigation in the Senate of Kentucky, Mr. Robert Wickliffe, a devoted friend of Mr. Clay, asserted, in his place, that Mr. Clay never did en-

tertain any ill feeling towards Mr. Adams, in consequence of the transactions at Ghent; in proof of which, he adduced Mr. Clay's declarations to himself; and he defied the friends of General Jackson to prove the contrary, by the evidence of any respectable man. Samuel Dariess, Esq. then arose from his place, and stated that the gentleman himself had, by his speeches and votes, in 1824, affirmed the truth of the charges against Mr. Adams; and he moreover produced a series of numbers, signed "*Wayne*," which were published in the "Liberty Hall and Cincinnati Gazette," at Cincinnati, Ohio, early in the fall of 1822, averring that they were written in Kentucky, sent to Mr. Clay, by him directly or indirectly forwarded to the State of Ohio, for publication: the proof of all which he declared he had at hand. Mr. Wickliffe sunk to his seat, overwhelmed at this prompt exposure, and no man dared say again that Mr. Clay had no objections to Mr. Adams on account of the Ghent negotiations. These numbers had passed through the hands of Mr. Clay, before the date of his letter to the Editors of the Intelligencer, and were at that very moment republishing in the Kentucky papers. To show how far Mr. Clay's *acts* differed from his *words*, we take the following extract from the third number of "Wayne."

"Ohio presents no candidate for the presidency at the approaching election. New York, with whose interests, next to those of her sister States in the west, Ohio is most intimately connected, offers no claimant whose prospects are not absolutely hopeless. At the head of those, whose pretensions are entitled to our serious consideration, is John Quincy Adams, the present Secretary of State. Will Ohio choose him? What interest has he shown for your roads and canals? Can it be expected that he, who would open to our rival and our enemy, the navigation of those canals, dug by the hand of God, for the use of the increasing millions of Western America, will promote our trade by making artificial ones? Instead of opening new avenues for our commerce, is it not to be feared that, in some future treaty, to secure some paltry privilege to an Eastern interest, he would render those which already exist, a curse, rather than a blessing? Our frontiers can testify, that we want not those men at the helm of the nation, who would, for any consideration, open new channels for British influence among our northern and western Indians. The horrors of past wars are not forgotten; and you will pause and count the value of many a brave man's life, before you raise to power one whose unfeeling policy would crimson your fresh fields with the blood of your border brethren, and light the midnight forest with the flames of their dwellings. Men, who would think of concessions so disastrous, are unworthy the support of Ohio: much more so, are those who reduce them to a serious proposition. The navigation of the Mississippi is too important to be bartered for the privilege of fishing in British waters. It is giving our wives and children for fish, and bartering the blood of our citizens for money. Conceal, explain, and sophisticate as he will, this was the tendency of the proposition, which was agitated at Ghent. But was this surprising? Under the same auspices, one of the most fertile and extensive provinces of the West, adequate to the formation of two States, was given to the Spaniards; the State of Louisiana, one of the most important and weakest points in the Union, was made a frontier, and exposed to sudden invasion from the adjoining empire. Is it a matter of deepest concern with us to exterminate the British influence among the northern and western Indians? The blood of slaughtered friends cries aloud to us from the ground. 'It is.' The policy of Mr. Adams introduces the British trader to their wigwam, by opening to him, under the guardianship of a treaty, the navigation of the Mississippi. Shall we sanction this, by sustaining him? Is it a matter of the last moment to us to protect our own navigation of the Ohio and Mississippi? Of what value is the Ohio or Mississippi to us, if Louisiana be occupied by an enemy? Yet Mr. Adams is of the Administration, which, in the traffic of territory, has made Louisiana a frontier. With such principles, John Quincy Adams can never receive the support of Ohio. He is too ignorant of our interests, or he disregards them."

From the fourth number of Wayne, we extract the following:

"The importance of having a Western man in the National Councils, as well as in all those situations where the interests of this section of the Union are brought in question, was never so strongly exemplified, as in the transactions attending the treaty of Ghent. It was proposed to open the Mississippi, through its whole extent, to the navigation of British subjects; thus giving them the most direct access to those numerous and warlike

tribes of Indians which border on our northern and western frontier. That any American statesman should, for a moment, have entertained so fatal a project, is as strange as the fact is alarming. To the presence of an able western man, may we attribute the defeat and abandonment of that atrocious proposal. But for the exertions of Henry Clay, the seeds of war might now have been sowing, along our northern and western borders, which, at no distant day, would have produced an abundant harvest of tears and blood. He found that a majority had resolved to make the fatal proposition. With a firmness which should endear him to the people of the West, he protested that he would sign no treaty which contained a stipulation so repugnant to his country's honor, and so dangerous to her peace. This firmness had the desired effect. The illustrious and lamented Bayard changed his mind, and then the West was saved. The danger we thus escaped, should sink deep into our hearts, and teach us a lesson as lasting as our lives."

This was the secret language of Mr. Clay, in relation to Mr. Adams. If it was not penned by his own hand, it passed through that hand, was thus adopted as its own, and then cast out upon the ocean of public opinion, without a name. He charges Mr. Adams with "*an unfeeling policy*," which "*would crimson our fresh fields with the blood of our border brethren, and light the midnight forest with the flames of their dwellings*;" with "*giving our wives and children for fish, and bartering the blood of our citizens for moneys*;" with being "*ignorant*" of western interests, or "*disregarding*" them. The proposition made at Ghent, he declares to be a "*fatal project*," an "*atrocious proposal*," "*as strange as it is alarming*;" and that but for his own exertions, "*the seeds of war might now have been sowing, along our northern and western borders, which, at no distant day, would have produced an abundant harvest of tears and blood.*"

Mr. Clay *secretly* throws out these awful charges among his countrymen, and in a few days afterwards comes forward, and publicly declares to the world, with an affected meekness and moderation, that he "*regrets*" the "*unfortunate controversy between two of his late colleagues*;" that the errors of Mr. Adams are "*doubtless unintentional*;" that he will not discuss the matter now, lest his "*motives*" should be misinterpreted; and that "it would be inexpressibly painful to him, at any time, to find it necessary to enter the field of disputation with either of his late colleagues!"

But this is only the commencement of Mr. Clay's undermining and disingenuous conduct in relation to Mr. Adams. About the time he wrote the foregoing celebrated letter to the Editors of the National Intelligencer, declining a controversy with Mr. Adams, lest his motives should be misconstrued, he called on his friend, the Editor of the Argus, published in Frankfort, Kentucky, for the purpose of correcting an error relative to the principles assumed at Ghent, which had brought upon that Editor and Mr. Clay the severe censure of Mr. Adams. He gave his friend a narrative of the proceedings at Ghent, and convinced him of his error. The Editor then took up the publication of Mr. Adams, and reviewed it in a series of Letters, addressed to John Quincy Adams. After these letters had been published in the Argus, Mr. Clay offered the Editor fifty dollars, towards defraying the expense of their republication in pamphlet form. Finally, one thousand copies were printed, in Lexington, by Mr. Tanner, and Mr. Clay paid one hundred dollars—about one-half of the expense—out of his own pocket, as the publisher lately testified before the Senate of Kentucky. By this act Mr. Clay adopted these Letters, and made them his own. He made himself responsible for all the statements they contain—if he be not, in substance, their author.

From the first of this series of Letters to Mr. Adams, we take the following extract:

"Against Mr. Clay you have made charges, which, if true, must degrade him in the estimation of his countrymen; and, if not, ought to disgrace you. In addition to numerous insinuations scattered throughout your book, you have, in the introduction, charged him, directly, with having, at Ghent, 'insisted, in principle, upon the sacrifice of an Eastern for the benefit of a Western interest;' at the same time asserting, that the national interest, which Mr. Clay thus insisted on sacrificing, was, compared with that for which the sacrifice was intended, as 'a million against a cent.'

"This is a serious charge. If it be true, Mr. Clay has compromitted the interests of his country, and does not deserve its confidence. If it be not true, you have borne 'false witness against your neighbor,' and deserve universal reprobation. That it is not true, we are

hold to assert: and we will prove our assertion by your own declarations."

The same letter thus lays down the topics intended to be discussed in the publication:—

"That you and the people may be at once apprized of the points which these letters are intended to embrace, we here state them in explicit terms:

"In Letter II., we shall show that you have grossly depreciated the extent and value of the British right to the navigation of the Mississippi, before the late war: in relation to which, it will be seen that your reiterated declarations are contradicted by facts; by the conduct of the American Government; and by your own conduct.

"In Letter III., we shall show that you exaggerate the extent of the fisheries which were contested at Ghent, in a degree as extravagant as you depreciate the British right to the navigation of the Mississippi: in relation to which, it will be seen, that your assertions and arguments are contradicted by the British Government, the American Government, and yourself.

"In Letter IV., we shall show that you were not authorized to offer any equivalent for the fisheries, or any part of them; and that you were expressly forbid to concede to the British the navigation of the Mississippi, for any consideration whatever: in proof of which, we shall adduce your instructions: the article first offered by Mr. Gallatin; (facts proving that the Mississippi is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States,) and your own declarations.

"In Letter V., we shall show that Mr. Clay's opposition to Mr. Gallatin's proposition was required by his instructions, as well as by sound policy: that the charge of changing sides, which you have made against him, is utterly unfounded, and may be retorted upon you; that the paragraph offered by him, to get rid of Mr. Gallatin's proposition, was not applicable to the British right of navigating the Mississippi, either in letter or principle; that, nevertheless, the majority did apply the same principle to the navigation of the Mississippi; that on this point you glaringly contradict yourself; and that your efforts to fix tergiversation and inconsistency on Mr. Clay, by adducing his original signatures as evidence of his individual opinions, is not only disingenuous, uncandid, and unjust, but, if admissible, would involve you in repeated contradictions, and prove that you have sacrificed important interests of your country.

"In Letter VI., we shall show that Mr. Gallatin's second proposition, which was also strenuously opposed by Mr. Clay, but finally adopted, and offered to the British Commissioners, was not authorized by your additional instructions, as a part of the *Status ante bellum;* was unnecessary to the conclusion of the peace, impolitic, and unjust.

"In Letter VII., we shall show that the principles on which you support our right to the fishing liberties, and the British right to the navigation of the Mississippi, are perfectly contradictory; the absurdities of your positions, and the discrepancies of your assertions, will be exhibited; and it will be seen, in conclusion, that your boasted principle, instead of being supported, in the negotiation of 1818, was virtually abandoned, in instructions drawn by your own hand.

"In Letter VIII., we shall give a short summary of our arguments; inquire what would have been the condition of the country, had the concessions offered by you, at Ghent, been accepted by our enemy; and exhibit, both by reason and the results, the superior wisdom of the course which was so zealously recommended by Mr. Clay.

"Letter IX. will be supplemental; in which we shall endeavor to show, as well by this as by other transactions, that you feel a direct hostility or total indifference to the interests of this section of the Union; and of course are not fit to preside over its destinies."

The same letter thus concludes:

"The air of correctness, the appearance of sincerity, and the vein of sarcasm, which pervade your writings, impel the admiring reader to assent to the truth of your assertions, without examining into the correctness of your premises, or the soundness of your conclusions. On a perusal and strict comparison of your arguments and assertions, the delusion will vanish; and instead of the stern vindicator of violated truth and insulted virtue, you will appear only as an able rhetorician, an artful sophist, a clumsy negotiator, and vindictive man."

The following is extracted from the second letter:

"You have attempted to prove—not by facts—but by assertion and prophecy, that the British right of navigating the Mississippi, before the late war, was a mere phantom, of no value to the British, and no injury to us; a right of travelling a highway, a privilege merely nominal, enjoyed for thirty years without use, a

naked right, a harmless right to travel a western highway, a mere nominal right, harmless to us. &c. &c. All these assertions, we are compelled to say, are directly contradicted by facts, by the conduct of our own government, and by your own conduct.

"Could you, Sir, be ignorant of Lieut. Pike's tour to the sources of the Mississippi, undertaken by the authority of our Government, and executed in the years 1805 and 1806? In all your negotiations relative to the Mississippi and the northern boundary, have you never adverted to the account given by that indefatigable soldier, relative to the British trading establishments on that river? Or, have you confined your researches wholly to the Atlantic coast, without once deigning to direct your attention to the rights, the interests, and the honor of the nation, on this side of the Alleghany Mountains? On this point, it appears to us, you are in a dilemma. Either you have never taken the trouble to inform yourself, relative to the great national western interests, which have been committed to your charge, or you have misrepresented and concealed facts, as you knew them to exist. It will be admitted by all, that your acknowledged habits of industry and research, leave little room for you to cover your errors on this point, with the mantle of ignorance.

"What says Lieut. Pike? He found no less than five British trading houses on the Mississippi and its waters, within the immediate vicinity of the river itself. He found British traders navigating the river, to and fro, almost from St. Louis to its source. He found numerous British medals among the Indians, distributed by these traders with the express object of obtaining an unbounded influence over their savage minds. He saw the British flag floating over British establishments on the waters of this very river. He estimated the duties on the British goods vended on the Mississippi station, not one dollar of which was ever paid, at thirteen thousand dollars per annum. That these facts are not misstated, or exaggerated, is proved by the following passages, extracted from 'Pike's Journal.'"

The same letter thus concludes:

"It was natural for Mr. Clay to think differently and feel differently from what you pretend to think, and actually felt, in relation to admitting the British to the navigation of the Mississippi. He could not conceal from himself the fact that the existence and use of this right had been one of the causes which led to the disasters of our arms on the northwestern frontiers, and the exposure of all our back settlements to the relentless ravages of a savage foe. He could not forget the consequent murders in Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio, a catalogue of enormities at which the heart sickens. Remembering all this, he could not but wish—nay, with his ardent and generous nature, he could not but urge, with much earnestness—the policy and justice of excluding the instigators of crimes so horrible, from every avenue of access to their willing instruments. Nor could he but feel differently from you. In consequence of the unlimited access of British emissaries to our Indians through the Mississippi and other channels, more of Kentucky's precious blood was spilt, than could be purchased with every fish that swims in British waters. Many dear friends, and one near connexion of Mr. Clay, had fallen victims to the Indian tomahawk, made of British anvils. When he departed for Europe, he left a social circle, and even a family, clothed in mourning for these victims of British influence over savage minds. Passing from the midst of the mourners and the maimed, how could he feel as you did, who, far distant from your bleeding country, engrossed with the events of another hemisphere, and admiring 'the Titus of his age,'* scarcely hear the thunder of war rolling over the heads of your countrymen, below the western horizon. It was surely natural that he and you should feel differently. You ought, therefore, to have excused Mr. Clay's zeal, against once more admitting the British traders among our Indians and hazarding a renewal of the bloody scenes of the Pigeon Roost, the River Raisin, and Fort Meigs. He could not calculate so coolly as you. If, in the excitement caused by recent Anglo-Indian murders, he preferred the lives of his fellow-citizens to all the fish which might perchance, be caught within three miles of the British coast, you ought to have considered, that his mind was not in a condition, coolly to weigh dollars against blood; and surely you would rather have excused him as a generous enthusiast, than censured him for compromitting the interests of his country. Now at least, ought you to excuse him, when you have adopted his own course, which

* "This is a literal extract of a letter written from Europe, by Mr. Adams, about the time Bonaparte's first dethronement."

has led to the securement of the fisheries, and a total exclusion of British traders, not only from the Mississippi, but from all American territory on this side of the Stony Mountains."

The third letter thus commences:

"Your declarations relative to the extent of the fisheries, which were contested at Ghent, are no less inconsistent with facts, than your assertions relative to the use and value of the British right to navigate the Mississippi. In following you through the mazes of your wonderful publication, we have been struck with astonishment at the contradiction and misrepresentation with which it abounds, relative to the portion of this great national interest, which was really contested by the British Government, at Ghent, and in the subsequent negotiation. In your replies to Mr. Russell, you have labored to prove, that the British notification given at that place, and their subsequent claims, extended to a total exclusion of the people of the United States from the whole fisheries; while it is proved by the language of your own private letters from Ghent, and from the documents relative to the subsequent negotiation, that their claims extended only to an exclusion of our fishermen from that portion of the fisheries situated within three miles of their shores; which is the utmost extent to which they possess, or even claim exclusive jurisdiction."

After a strong argument on the subject, the fourth letter comes to the following conclusion:

"By facts, by the rights of your country, and by your own assertions, we have proved, that at the time of the negotiation at Ghent, the British Government possessed no territory on the Mississippi, and that, consequently, that river was within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. In supporting and voting for Mr. Gallatin's proposition, you therefore committed a violation of the very letter of your instructions; and your declarations at the time, as well as subsequently, to the British Government, prove that you did it knowingly."

The fifth letter contains the following: "You charge Mr. Clay with pursuing a sectional course, with being willing to sacrifice one important eastern, to a trifling western interest. Was not your own course wholly sectional? For whose immediate benefit are the fisheries? For that of the east. Who was to pay the tribute to the British king for their security? The people of the west. You proposed to tax the west for the benefit of the east; not indeed to purchase any new right or advantage for the enjoyment of our eastern brethren, but to buy off a pirate who threatened to capture and confiscate their ships. It would have been more equitable to have bought security at the expense of the fishermen, if it must be bought at all. What would they have said, had you offered a stipulation that their security in the enjoyment of an undoubted right should be purchased by giving to the British king, one half of the fish caught by them within his jurisdiction. Think you, they would have applauded you, and made you presents of codfish, for your wisdom and patriotism in thus securing the fisheries? Yet this, although an outrage on the fishermen and their country, would be more equitable than the proposition for which you voted. New England could not suffer more, and she could dread less, by paying as a tribute to the British king, one half the fish caught within his jurisdiction, than would the western country by the unrestrained navigation of the Mississippi by British subjects. Hence, you would not only sacrifice a western to an eastern interest; but even make the western people pay an exclusive tax of rivalship, war, and blood, for the security of those fishermen who frequent British waters."

The seventh letter thus commences: "Throughout your publication it is curious to observe how you shift your ground, and vary your premises in such manner as to arrive with certainty at any given conclusion. Give you the point to be proved, and your fertile mind is sure not to lack for evidence. If the facts do not suit your purpose, you can manufacture others. If an asserted principle is not adapted to the end, you can assert its opposite. If it be necessary to your purpose, that an important right be proved worthless, by the waving of your goose quill it is reduced to "a mere phantom." If it be wanted in negotiation as an equivalent for another important right, in an instant it receives bone and sinew, and muscle from your mighty incantations. But of all your shiftings to make your argument appear to the best advantage before the people, there is none more remarkable than those relative to the nature of the treaty of 1783, and the rights secured by its provisions."

The same letter thus speaks:

"It was not without astonishment, that we discovered how presumptuously, in the short space of eight pages, you have sport-

ed with your own character for consistency, and with the credulity of your countrymen. That one who writes with almost unexampled rapidity, should forget in page 104 what he had said in page 100, is hardly credible; but that any man who has the least regard for his own reputation, should, with his memory and his senses fresh about him, have the hardihood wilfully to involve himself in the grossest contradictions, staggers all human belief. We rather suppose that with a vivid fancy and powerful intellect, you invent as you pass along, premises and arguments to suit a predetermined conclusion, on which you strike as certainly, and with a course as crooked, as the lightning falls upon its destined object."

The eighth letter thus commences:

"In what attitude do you now stand before the American people, and what has become of those statements of facts and opinions, which you proudly declare would "stand the test of human scrutiny, of talents, and of time?" We have proved, that your representations relative to the worthlessness of the British right to navigate the Mississippi, are contradicted by the evidence of facts, by the conduct of the American government, and by your own conduct.

"We have proved that your representations relative to the extent of the fisheries, from which it was the intention of the British government to exclude American citizens, are contradicted by facts, by the language of the American government, by the declarations of the British government, and by your own declarations.

"We have shown that the fisheries contested at Ghent, were those situated within three miles of the British coasts, to secure which, it was proposed to renew the right of British subjects to navigate the Mississippi, with access to it through our northwest territories; that this offer was not only not authorized, but was positively prohibited by your instructions; and that it was unnecessary, impolitic, and unjust.

"We have shown that, in the first instance, this offer was defeated by the zeal and perseverance of Mr. Clay, by whom it was strenuously opposed, on its every appearance, and every shape: that the paragraph offered by him, neither in language nor principle, was applied or was applicable to the British right of navigating the Mississippi: and that your attempt to prove the contrary, by adducing his official [illegible]tures, is a disingenuous effort to fix on him opinions which you know he did not entertain, and acts which you know he did not perform.

"We have shown, that Mr. Gallatin's second proposition, which was finally offered to the British Commissioners, was not authorized nor justified by your additional instructions, was strenuously opposed by Mr. Clay, was impolitic, unjust, and not necessary to the conclusion of the peace, or the security of any right belonging to the citizens of the United States.

"We have pointed out many of your inconsistencies and contradictions, both in argument and language; have exhibited your concealments and perversion of known facts; have shown you vainly endeavoring to shelter yourself from censure by testing the meaning of your instructions by the claims of our enemy, making the boundaries and territory of your country, as well as our right to navigate the Mississippi, a conditional grant, the condition of which we have expressly refused to fulfil, arguing against the rights of independent nations in favor of British monopoly, and jeopardizing our rights to the whole fisheries, by making them dependant on a contested principle.

"In fine, we have shown that your boasted publications relative to the Ghent mission, are full of absurdities, inconsistencies, and contradictions; and that the injustice of your denunciations against your colleagues of the minority, can only be equalled by the eloquence and boldness with which they are uttered."

The same letter contains the following passages:

"Had you, Sir, been in Frankfort during the last war, you would not have treated this subject so lightly. There was scarcely an individual in this place, perhaps not even one who had not a husband, father, brother, or friend in the northwestern army. Yet, resting in the justice of a good cause, and the confidence of victory, no cloud obscured the serenity of their enjoyment, no melancholy forebodings depressed their buoyant spirits, or checked the current of their usual amusements. On the night when the news of the fatal catastrophe at the River Raisin arrived in town, there was a performance in the theatre, which was attended by the Governor, a brilliant assemblage of ladies, and a large concourse of the members of the Legislature, citizens and strangers. An express arrived from the army; a person entered the theatre, and whispered to the Governor; not a word was said aloud; but like an electric shock, the tid-

ings spread through the audience; all arose as one man, and almost in a moment the theatre was empty. Nothing but the bloody scene itself could exceed the distresses of that night. All were inquiring with the eagerness of hope and apprehension for their husbands, fathers, brothers and friends; but all they could learn was, that the army had been defeated, and most of it massacred.

"All joy and amusement vanished, and months elapsed before every family knew the extent of its misfortunes. Daily the widows and orphans—made so on that fatal day—present themselves in our streets; some of them begging the means of subsistence for their destitute mothers, and all of them a living caution to American statesmen to cut off, as far as possible, all intercourse between British subjects and the savages of our wilderness. This is the case in which a citizen of Massachusetts was 'above sympathy;' and this, you would seem indirectly to contend, was 'no injury to us!'

"The repetition of such scenes, would have been the fruit of your policy.

"By the past, by the present, by the conduct of our own Government, and by your own conduct, we have shown that the navigation of the Mississippi was, and would have continued to be, useful to British subjects, and fraught with innumerable dangers to the citizens of the United States. We hold you as the author, at least in mind, of all the evils which would have flowed from this disastrous concession; and in rendering you that justice which you demand, from the inhabitants of the West, we shall show you, by our voice and our vote, that we consider your course at Ghent, and still more your vindication in 1822, as full proof that your views are too narrow, your feelings too sectional, and your temper too vindictive, for the Chief Magistrate of a free people. Had we no interests but the fisheries; were the safety of our frontiers to be entirely lost in the prospect of gain by fishing in British waters; were no national interest to be promoted but that which is encouraged by a bounty; did we want a President who would make our uncontested rights in the fisheries depend on a contested principle, and zealously support British monopoly against the rights of independent nations; then, indeed, might we bestow on you our suffrages."

The ninth letter is supplemental, and attempts to prove Mr. Adams's settled hostility to the western country.—The following are extracts:

"It is the object of this letter to prove, by your public acts, that you have uniformly been actuated by a deadly hostility, or a culpable indifference, to the interests of the western country. Startle not, brethren of the East; we are not about to advance any sectional pretensions, or charge you in mass with partiality and injustice. It is a few of your statesmen, only, against whom we level our charge; and as you have done heretofore, so we trust you will again protect us, against their sectional and disastrous policy."

Again:

"The purchase of Louisiana was the first great incident, which gave vent, in public acts, to your hostile feelings towards the western country. Elected by the Federal party in Massachusetts, who openly avowed opposition to the extension of our national limits, you then held a seat in the Senate of the United States. It would have been unnatural, had you not participated in the feelings of a party of which you were a leader and a favorite. Accordingly, we find you, as a Senator, voting against a bill enabling the President to take possession of Louisiana; against extending the laws of the United States to the territory; against dividing it into two territories, for the greater convenience both of the government and the people; against the power of Congress to tax it, for purposes of government; and even against opening post roads to New-Orleans, through the Indian country, within our former territories!"

Again:

"But we do not believe there is one sincere word in all your defence, relative to your votes on the subject of Louisiana. In your pretended opinions, your absurdities and contradictions, we can see nothing but that hostility to the western country, and the administration of Jefferson, which characterized your fellow-laborers of that day—Osgood and Parish, Quincy and Pickering. That you should now pronounce the annexation of Louisiana—that greatest and most glorious act of Jefferson's glorious administration—an assumption of constructive power more transcendant than 'all the other constructive powers assumed by Congress, from the 4th of March, 1789, to this day,' and still claim the support of republicans of the Jefferson school, is absolutely amazing. No man but the son of John Adams—the satirist of Mr. Jefferson—the reviler of Paine's Rights of Man—could have hazarded this assertion. What! Jefferson sanction an assumption of constructive

power more condescendant and dangerous than the acts of John Adams' administration? An Adams says it; and a nation pronounces it untrue.

"Your hostility to western interests again burst forth at Ghent. In your trepidation, lest, perchance, the people of New England lose the liberty of fishing in British waters, you forgot the sufferings and dangers of the bleeding West; the obligations which you owed to your adventurous brethren in this section of the Union; and even your positive instructions. When called on to vindicate your needless and unauthorized concessions, you equivocate, conceal facts, contradict yourself, impeach the integrity of your colleagues, attempt to prove our right to navigate the Mississippi a mere conditional British grant, while you shudder at the application of the same principle to the fishing liberties; and, finally, assert that the Western country had no interest at stake; that the navigation of our river never had been, and never could be, of any 'injury to us' or 'benefit to the British;' thus adding insult and mockery to abandonment and injustice."

Thus did Mr. Clay charge Mr. Adams with "*bearing false witness against his neighbor;*" with "*falsehood*" in relation to the navigation of the Mississippi; almost, with *the massacre* of one of his own "*near connexions;*" with "*weighing dollars against blood;*" with "*falsehoods*" relative to the extent of the fisheries, contested at Ghent; with "*knowingly violating the very letter of his instructions;*" with pursuing "*a course wholly sectional;*" with attempting to "*make the Western people pay an exclusive tax of rivalship, war and blood, for the security of those fishermen who frequent British waters;*" with "*manufacturing facts;*" with asserting "*opposite principles;*" with gross "*absurdities, inconsistencies and contradictions;*" with injustice to his colleagues of the minority; with a policy promoting Indian wars and massacres; with "*a deadly hostility, or a culpable indifference, to the interests of the Western country;*" with hostility to the annexation of Louisiana to the United States; with insincerity in the defence of his votes, in relation to the West; with "*adding insult and mockery to abandonment and injustice;*" with being "*an artful sophist, a clumsy negotiator, and vindictive man;*" with "*views too erroneous, feelings too sectional, and temper too vindictive, for the Chief Magistrate of a free people!*" Yes, the same Henry Clay, who, in November, 1822, had "*witnessed with very great regret the unhappy controversy*" about this Ghent negotiation, declared Mr. Adams' errors to be "*no doubt unintentional,*" and said it would be "*inexpressibly painful*" to him to "*enter into the field of disputation with either of his late colleagues,*" both before and after the date of this letter—assuming a stand so impartial, and a bearing so lofty—was using every exertion *secretly* to injure the reputation and destroy the standing of Mr. Adams. This *generous* man—so *high-minded* and *honorable*—would not *state the facts* under the responsibility of his name, lest his *motives* might be misinterpreted; lest he should be supposed to be *electioneering*, and *endeavoring to elevate himself upon the ruins of Mr. Adams!* yet he did not hesitate, with his own money, and his own hand, to scatter far and wide the most aggravated charges against his rival, for the very purpose of which he so modestly dreaded to be suspected!

This was the attitude in which Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay stood towards each other at the approach of the late Presidential election. Mr. Clay, while maintaining a lofty and disinterested exterior, refusing even to tell the truth in relation to Mr. Adams, lest he should subject his motives to suspicion, was privately endeavoring to vilify, degrade, and destroy him. Mr. Adams, understanding the character, and watching the movements of Mr. Clay, had denounced him to the nation, in conjunction with his coadjutor Russell, and set him at open defiance. Their hostility was as great as could arise from eager rivalry, reciprocal injuries, and mutual recrimination. If Mr. Clay believed Mr. Adams guilty of the charges which he circulated against him, he must have considered him *one of the basest of mankind*, unfit for private trust or public station. If he did not believe them, he must have looked on himself as *a slanderer* and libeller, as destitute of truth, as the means resorted to were distant from all that was open, manly, or honorable. Whether the charges were true or false, what must Mr. Adams have thought of Mr. Clay? How could he take to his bosom, one who he knew had been plotting his ruin from "the seed time of 1814, to the harvest of 1822," pursuing his object with a malice and perseverance which seemed insatiable, except by his entire destruction? Surely, nothing could have been more unnatural and less to be expected, than that two men thus situated, should, without the

retraction of error, or the confession of injury, without explanation or apology, rush into each other's arms, embark their mutual fortunes in the same cause, solicit a common support, and seek a common fame.

In addition to these facts, which would seem for ever to have barred an union between two individuals, either of whom paid the least regard to his own honor, there was, in PRINCIPLE, an insuperable barrier between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay, had the latter been directed or restrained by any such consideration. One of the principal objections made by Mr. Clay and all his friends to the election of Mr. Adams, was founded in the dangers which threatened our institutions from a perpetuation of the cabinet succession. It was maintained by them, that by the uniform election of the Secretary of State to the office of President, our government was assimilating to a monarchy, in which each Chief Magistrate appoints his successor. This argument was urged against Mr. Adams in every possible shape, and deservedly, with considerable effect.

Early in 1822, a series of numbers was published in the Argus of Western America, at Frankfort, Kentucky, signed "A Western Citizen." We have good reason to believe, that these essays were from the pen of Mr. Clay himself. The opinions they contain, and even the expressions, almost perfectly coincide with those advanced and promulgated by him in other situations. The first of these numbers contains the following declarations:

"The National Intelligencer is not, precisely, the most fitting paper to issue this edict commanding silence. It might, indeed, suit the taste of their official patrons and employers, that as little as possible should be published on this subject. They may prefer, that the prescribed line of legitimacy, according to which the heir apparent should be translated from the Department of State to the Palace, be preserved unbroken and entire. But they ought to remember the practice of Rome, by which the Cæsars themselves, to secure that tranquillity which the Editors of the Intelligencer so much desire, provided beforehand for the imperial succession, has not yet been engrafted on our Constitution."

The Kentucky Reporter, edited by Mr. Smith, a friend, connexion, and devoted instrument of Mr. Clay, contained both previous and subsequent to this period, many articles bitterly opposed to the Secretary succession. We shall content ourselves with making one extract from the number of that paper, dated July 15th, 1818, which is a good specimen of the language held down to the very moment of the election, by that paper, as well as all others devoted to the elevation of Mr. Clay. The Reporter says:

"Mr. Adams is designated by the President and his presses as the heir apparent, the next successor to the Presidency. Since the principle was introduced, there has been a rapid degeneracy in the Chief Magistrate; and the prospect of still greater degeneracy, is strong and alarming. Admit the people should acquiesce in the Presidential appointment of Mr. Adams to that high office; who again will he choose as his successor? Will it be Josiah Quincy, H. G. Otis, or Rufus King? An aristocrat, at least, if not a TRAITOR, will be our portion."

The chief object of supporting Mr. Clay in Ohio, as avowed by his friends in their Address of July, 1824, was to break up the cabinet succession. This address was signed by the Hon. Joseph Vance, then and now a member of Congress, the same who voted with Mr. Clay for the very "cabinet successor," against whom its denunciation was evidently directed, and was written, as we are authorized to state, by Charles Hammond, the subsequent scurrilous reviler of Mrs. Jackson, and devoted partisan of Mr. Adams' administration. The following is an extract from the Address:

"As the period approached when it would become necessary to select a successor to President Monroe, it was altogether proper that much reflection should be devoted to the principles upon which such election should be made. The names of at least three members of Mr. Monroe's cabinet were pretty distinctly presented to the public, as candidates to succeed him. Reflecting men could not but see that a struggle for the Presidency between the principal Secretaries, was fraught with much evil to the nation, inasmuch as it must distract the harmony of her councils, if not endanger the integrity of her functionaries, and jeopardize her peace and her reputation. Besides these mischiefs, to select one of the Secretaries, was to continue the same influence in office, which virtually would be a departure from the maxim, that rotation in office was essential to the public. For, to change the man and retain the influence, would be to repose upon the shadow and abandon the substance.

To be continued in our next.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published, weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*

By GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, MAY 10, 1828. No. 11.

REPLY

By the Jackson Corresponding Committee of the District of Columbia, to Mr. Clay's last Address.

[CONTINUED.]

The considerations here briefly hinted, determined many of the most reflecting citizens of the country to adopt the opinion, that no member of the present executive cabinet ought to be selected to succeed Mr. Monroe; and this determination was formed without any disrespect to the talents or characters of the incumbents themselves. It rested upon public principle and upon public duty, and upon these alone. In looking around for some person out of the cabinet, and unconnected with the executive administration of the national government, a large portion of the citizens of the West, naturally directed their attention to Henry Clay, of Kentucky."

In relation to the prospects before them, the address thus speaks:

"Under the strong persuasion that the public good, and a due regard for the fair operation for the republican maxim of "rotation in office," required that the next President should not be taken from the present executive cabinet, it was determined to support Mr. Clay for that office, as the person, combining at least as many qualifications, as any other that could be named, with the same prospects of success. It was hoped that those who had the same general object in view, would have sacrificed personal considerations, and united in effecting that object. It was particularly hoped, that the western country would have presented an undivided phalanx, upon this great public question, and it is deeply regretted that another candidate should be named and supported in the west, with the same object, and for the same purpose."

Again, the same address says:

Were Mr. Clay withdrawn, the result, as to the election by the electors, would most probably be the same; or if it were not, it *would place in the Presidential chair one of the present cabinet;* an event which it was *the first object of the friends of Mr. Clay to prevent;* not in reference to the men, but the principle. Mr. Clay was nominated in the persuasion that all his fellow-citizens, entertaining the same general views, would unite in his support. Had this been the case; had this union taken place, his election by the electors, would have been certain. It is the clear conviction of his supporters, that *the object of nominating him,* can only be attained by adhering to him that to abandon him, is to abandon *that object* and under this conviction, they have adopted the resolution to adhere to him, as the dictate of duty and off patriotism."

From these extracts it appears that the *first object* of nominating and supporting Mr. Clay in Ohio, was to break the line of cabinet succession, and that it was the hope of effecting that object, which induced them to adhere to him. How would the 300 individuals composing the meeting which adopted this address, have startled, had an angel spoke, and told them, that the very act they were then performing, would not only enable Mr. Clay to defeat their object, but that he would certainly do it, and then turn round and tauntingly tell them, he had but followed a "*safe precedent!*" Would not his very friends have denounced him as ....."A TRAITOR?" After denouncing the cabinet succession, and stimulating the whole mass of his friends to electioneer on that ground, we repeat, that Mr. Clay could never have voted for Mr. Adams, if he had been in the least degree influenced by *principle.*

With Mr. Crawford, it has never been pretended that Mr. Clay's relations were other than friendly. During the latter part of the canvass, the idea was certainly inculcated by Mr. Clay and his leading friends, that Mr. Crawford was their second choice. The state of his health was as well known to them then, as after the electoral election. Considering his relations with the two men, it could not have been anticipated that Mr. Clay would prefer Mr. Adams to Mr. Crawford. Had he voted for the latter, leaving his friends without influence or control, to vote for whom they thought proper, though it would have been acting against the known will of the people of Kentucky, Mr. Clay would at least have avoided some of the imputations which have been indelibly fixed upon his character, by his unnatural coalition with Mr. Adams.

It was thought by Mr. Clay's friends, and the public in general, that there was some degree of personal hostility between him and General Jackson. It has been extensively urged, that the known ill will of the General, and particularly the indignity offered Mr. Clay at Lebanon, in Kentucky, made it impossible for Mr. Clay to vote for him without dishonor. Mr. Clay's late address has totally destroyed this argument. It appears by his own showing, that he never cherished any personal enmity towards General Jackson, and that the only breach between them which ever existed, was entirely healed, as early as 1823. The following is his account of the reconciliation: "Such was the state of our relations at the commencement of the session of Congress, in 1823, the interval having passed without my seeing him. Soon after his arrival here to attend that session, I collected from certain indications, that he had resolved upon a general amnesty, the benefit of which was to be extended to me. He became suddenly reconciled with some individuals between whom & himself there had been a long existing enmity. The greater part of the Tenesssee delegation, (all I believe, except Mr. Eaton and Gen. Cocke) called on me together early in the session, for the express purpose, as I understood, of producing a reconciliation between us. I related, in substance, all the above circumstances, including the meeting at Lebanon. By way of apology for his conduct at Lebanon, some of the gentlemen remarked, that he did not intend any disrespect of me, but that he was laboring under some indisposition. I stated that the opinions I had expressed in the House of Representatives in regard to General Jackson's military transactions, had been sincerely entertained, and were still held; but that, being opinions in respect to public acts, they never had been supposed by me to form any just occasion for private enmity between us, and that none had been cherished on my part. Consequently, there was no obstacle on my side to a meeting with him and maintaining a respectful intercourse." He then proceeds to state, that he dined with General Jackson, and the General with him—that they rode in a carriage together; and that they "frequently met during the winter, always respectfully addressing each other." So entire was the reconciliation, and so cordial were Mr. Clay's feelings towards General Jackson, that, in the fall of 1824, he told several gentlemen, (friendly to the election of General Jackson) in Lexington, that he had written to the General, inviting him to take Lexington in his way to Washington, that they might accompany each other. Mr. Clay, in his address, does not deny having written this letter, but gives permission for its publication. It is now ascertained that the letter, if written, was never received, and circumstances lately developed, induce the belief that it was part of the system of deception, by which Mr. Clay endeavored to prevent an expression of public opinion in Kentucky, by inducing the friends of General Jackson in that State, to believe that he would vote for General Jackson, whether instructed by the legislature or not.

Such was the impression produced by his conversations with Mr. Carneal, of the Senate of Kentucky, Mr. Barry, and others; and his declaration to Messrs. Wickliffe, Moore, and Henry, his colleagues in Congress, whom he advised to hold themselves un- committed, saying that they could vote for either, and justify themselves before their constituents, clearly proves that he himself was prepared, under a contingency, to vote for Gen. Jackson. [*See Appendix.*]

It is easy to see that had Mr. Clay desired to secure the situation of Secretary of State, as the price of his vote, it was important to prevent any expression of public sentiment by the people or the legislature, which bound him to prefer either of the candidates. Having resolved to substitute his own will for that of his constituents, and having likewise resolved to determine his own choice by an arrangement subsequently to be entered into, it was important to prevent any movement on the part of the legislature, or the people which might impede his negotiations or embarrass his attempts at justification. That he would have made terms with Gen. Jackson, and that our view of his motives is correct, is strongly coroborated by the manner in which he met Gen. Jackson on his arrival at Washington, as detailed by Gen. Call. [*See Gen. Call's letter.*]

Speaking of Gen. Jackson, Mr, Clay says: "Shortly after his arrival, he called on me, but I was out. I returned the visit, considering it, in both instances, one of mere ceremony."

Although this narrative of the reconciliation differs from that given by Judge Isaacs and Mr. Blair, it proves by Mr. Clay's own confession, that there was no obstacle existing in their private relations, to his voting for General Jackson. He expressly says *no enmity* "had *been cherished on my part.*" According to "the

laws which regulate men of honor," Mr. Clay might therefore have voted for General Jackson.

Having exhibited the attitude in which Mr. Clay stood towards each of the other candidates, let us now trace his footsteps through the canvass which preceded the election. Until the winter of 1823–4, Mr. Clay considered Mr. Adams his most formidable competitor. Upon him he turned all the artillery of the press, which he could wield, and at the same time, as we have seen, resorted to all the stratagems of an artful and ambitious adversary. The claims set up by a portion of the people in behalf of General Jackson, he at first considered as wholly unavailing and utterly hopeless. He charged Mr. Adams and his friends with bringing forward the General to di-vide the West and defeat his (Mr. Clay's) election. Towards Mr. Crawford he seemed to cast an eye of friendly regard, and the impression was circulated through the Union, that, if he failed himself, that gentleman would be his second choice. Mr. Adams was the only candidate upon whom he waged a war of extermination, and the people of the United States were led to believe, that he would ally himself with any man or any party, to prevent his election.—[*See Mr. Randolph's declaration in Congress, Appendix.*]

The progress of Jackson's popularity during the year 1823, and the first part of the year 1824, was alarming to all his competitors, and had deprived Mr. Clay of his last hope of being elected by the people. Under those circumstances, what was his obvious duty? Had he declined the canvass, and postponed his pretensions to a more propitious period, he would have elevated himself in the estimation of the American people. But an overweening ambition suggested to him a different course, and, in a fatal moment, he suffered himself to be misled by its bright illusions. What he could not gain by the votes of the people, he now determined to achieve by bold and artful management. If he could but reach the House of Representatives, he flattered himself, that through his popularity and influence in that body, he should be able to overcome all competition, and place himself in the Presidential chair. But if he failed in reaching that body, the same power would enable him to control and profit by the event of the election. These views were disclosed with sufficient clearness in the communications of his friends at Washington, to every part of the Union, early in 1824, advising his adherents to remain firm in their support. It will be sufficient for our purpose, to quote only the language which was used on this point in *official documents*. The friends of Mr. Clay at Washington City, in May, 1824, published a Circular, from which the following is an extract:

"Entertaining the highest respect for the other candidates, they (Mr. C's friend at Washington) will not indulge in any invidious comparison of their strength. But it may perhaps be assumed, that, if from any cause, Mr. Crawford should not receive the vote of N. York—if Gen. Jackson should not receive the support of some of the doubtful States—or if Mr. Adams should not receive the vote of New York, Mr. Clay must be returned to the House, without calculating any of the contingent or probable events that may render that vote certain.

"If, contrary to all probability, Mr. Clay should not be returned to the House, his friends, having done their duty, will be able, *by concentration, to control the event*. They will hold in their hands the balance. They will determine between the opposing and conflicting interests, and secure to the country a *Republican* Administration.

"Under all the views taken, it is determined to recommend to his friends to adhere to him steadily, and to await the issue now depending before the people."

This address, we have good authority for believing, was written by Mr. Clay, and copied by Mr. Francis Johnson, and its reference to the importance of "securing to the country a *republican* administration," was evidently aimed at Mr. Adams, who was habitually characterized by Mr. Clay and his friends as the federal candidate.

Thus, in May, 1824, so precarious were Mr. Clay's prospects, that he doubted whether he would reach the House of Representatives, as one of the three highest candidates, and yet he advises the supporters of his cause "*to adhere to him steadily.*" What was the object? He distinctly avows it—it was "*by concentration to control the event*" in the House of Representatives. If Mr. Clay's friends, on finding his prospects hopeless, had divided off, and given their support to other candidates, they would not have been concentrated in the House; which would have left him as powerless as any other individual. A rally was therefore necessary, not with any sanguine hope of securing his election, but to enable him "*to control the event.*"

On the 15th of the [illegible]

meeting was held by Mr. Clay's partisans at Columbus, in Ohio, who published an Address to prevent defection among his friends in that State, in which, as we have already seen, it is declared that the object of nominating him was to prevent the Secretary succession, and that "it is the clear conviction of his supporters that the object of nominating him, can only be attained by adhering to him; that to abandon him is to abandon that object: and, under this conviction, they have adopted the resolution to adhere to him, as the dictate of duty and patriotism."

At this time, the tide of Jackson's popularity was inundating the whole Western country, threatening to sweep away, by depriving him of every vote except that of Kentucky, Mr. Clay's last hope of being able "*to control the event.*" His committee in Kentucky, alarmed at the portent around them, thought it necessary to raise the drooping spirits of his friends, and confirm them in their adherence to his falling fortunes. The result of their deliberations was another Circular, issued in September, 1824, which has become celebrated, as well for developing the object of Mr. Clay, as for the prophetic spirit with which it foretold the means by which the contest would be finally decided. In relation to the former point, the committee thus speak:

"We do not hesitate to avow our belief, that the fullest and fairest investigation and consideration, must lead to the conclusion, that no one of the four candidates will unite a majority of the Electoral votes; that the election must devolve upon the House of Representatives; that no one single candidate can outnumber the vote of Mr. Clay in that body; and that he is decidedly the choice of a majority of the people, as well as a majority of the States."

Again: "In fine, Mr. Clay considers himself wholly in the hands of the people: and we, as his friends and supporters, believing him worthy of our continued exertions, and that his prospects of success are still unclouded and brightening, avow our determination, and we believe we speak the language of all his friends, to abide by our preference to the last. If he should be returned to the House of Representatives, we have little doubt of his final election, with the approbation and applause of the majority of the nation: but if any untoward circumstance should prevent his being one of the three highest, his friends in Congress, by throwing their weight into the scale of the most *Republican and National* candidate, will have it in their power to defeat the ends of political management, and see that the Republic sustains no injury."

From this language it is notorious, that almost the only hope of Mr. Clay's friends was to enable him "*to control the event.*" It was not a little singular, that men who were obviously laboring to throw the election into the House of Representatives that Mr. Clay might profit by the result, should have declared, at the same time, the manner in which the election was to be decided in that body. On this point they use the following strong language:

"And let them (the people) remember, that after the choice of Electors once takes place, their voice will be no more heard in the contest. All will be carried by influence and intrigue, bargain and management. He who has the most extensive means of influence, and will promise the most favors, will have the best prospect of success; and the nation will receive the President, not from the pure hands of the people, but from a club of political managers and intriguers."

Mr. John J. Crittenden, the private and confidential friend of Mr. Clay, has admitted that he, aided by a friend, was the writer of this address: and it has been charged, & never yet denied by Mr. Crittenden, or Mr. Clay, that it was written after a consultation of his friends at a meeting held at Harrodsburgh, for the purpose of devising means to prevent the utter abandonment of Mr. Clay by the people. Of this meeting, Mr. Clay himself was a member.

Taking this circular together, and considering its declarations in connexion with the principles it avows, it is as explicit as words can make it, that the ultimate object then was to enable Mr. Clay to head the "*club of political managers,*" to avail himself of "*promised favors,*" and give the country a President by "*influence and intrigue, bargain and management.*" This prediction, so well verified by the event, could not have flowed from the pen of any confidential manager of Mr. Clay, who understood his objects and designs. It must have been interpolated by the hand of some man who foresaw what would be the means resorted to for carrying the election, but knew not that such was the ultimate object to which all the exertions of Mr. Clay and his confidential friends were then unitedly tending. On any other supposition, that paper was an open avowal, that Mr. Clay and his friends in Congress, would be ready for sale to the highest bidder! That such

ished on my part." According to "the

was the fact, in relation to himself, is amply confirmed by the result; but it cannot be imagined, that the authors of that circular had the effrontery intentionally to avow it.

There can be no doubt, that Mr. C's partisans at Washington and in Kentucky, acted in concert with Mr. Clay, and in furtherance of his ultimate designs. But if there had been room for a doubt, it was wholly obviated by the subsequent conduct of Mr. Clay himself. The system of non-committals upon which he acted, was commenced in the Washington circular as early as May, 1824, and continued in that of the Kentucky committee. The former said, Mr. Clay's friends "*will hold in their hands the balance*," and "*by concentration, control the event.*" The latter said, "*his friends in Congress, by throwing their weight into the scale of the most republican and national candidate, will have it in their power to defeat the ends of political management, and see that the Republic sustains no injury.*" Neither declared who was their second choice. That point was to be left to Mr. Clay. That only was to be considered a republican administration, which should embrace him as one of the cabinet.

As early as October, 1824, Mr. Clay began to prepare the minds of his friends for ulterior operations in Congress. In that month he met with the Honorable C. A. Wickliffe and the Honorable Thomas P. Moore, in Frankfort, and personally expressed to them an apprehension, which all his movements and those of his leading partisans had indicated, that he should not be one of the three returned to the House of Representatives; and intimated, that, in that event, he would hold himself uncommitted, which he represented to be the true policy of his friends. *See Appendix, No. 2 and 4.*

The Legislature of Kentucky met on the first day of November, and Mr. Clay was still in Frankfort. The people of Kentucky had already begun to speak loudly of General Jackson as their second choice, in the event that Mr. Clay should be excluded from the House of Representatives, and the Legislature partook of the general feeling. The rumor soon began to circulate, that if the apprehension of Mr. Clay's exclusion should be well founded, the Legislature would, as soon as the fact was known, express the voice of the State, and request their Representatives to vote for General Jackson. At that time, there were two parties in that body, both professing equal friendship for Mr. Clay, and both, with a few individual exceptions, uniting upon General Jackson as their second choice. It did not comport with Mr. Clay's policy or designs to be trammelled by any expression of public opinion. It was not the people of Kentucky, or of the United States, who were "to control the event," but Mr. Clay and his friends in Congress. As the surest mode of avoiding the embarrassment into which he would be thrown by an expression of legislative opinion, as well as the responsibility of disregarding it, he applied in person to several members of that body, for the purpose of dissuading them from taking any such step. He has himself disclosed one part of this intrigue, and another has come to light in the late investigation by the Senate of Kentucky.

In his Address, page 51, is a letter from Col. James Davidson, Treasurer of Kentucky, who, in 1824, was a member of the Senate. He states, that he was induced to oppose the resolutions of instruction, when they were before the Senate, by information previously received from Mr. Clay himself, that he would not vote for General Jackson. He says, he told the Senate, that "all the resolutions we could pass during the whole session, would not induce you (Mr. Clay) to abandon what you conceived to be your duty, and that I knew you could not concur with the majority of the Legislature on that subject." He says he informed several persons of the conversation with Mr. Clay, and names "George Robertson, Esq. late Speaker of the House of Representatives" as one. By recurrence to the proceedings in that House, we perceive, that Mr. Robertson moved to lay the resolutions on the table until a day beyond the close of the session, and gave as his reasons, "that their adoption would be unjust to our members of Congress, who know the will of the people better than we do; that it would be indelicate to Mr. Clay; that it would lessen the weight of Kentucky in the next administration; that it was better to leave our members of Congress to act according to contingencies; that the weight and importance of the State, and the Western country, could, in that manner, be best secured; that our members on the spot would be the best judges of what was just and expedient; that the resolutions would not only degrade our respected fellow-citizen, but throw Kentucky on the electioneering arena in Congress, completely handcuffed." It was impossible to mis-

understand this language, and *Mr. Shepherd*, a member of the House, said, on the same occasion, that "some of the friends of Mr. Clay, he had no doubt, wished to defeat the resolutions, and leave that gentleman to make the best bargain he could. But he did not wish the vote of Kentucky to be bartered away, or that Mr. Clay should be Secretary of State to the exclusion of Jackson as President."—[*See Appendix, No.* 2.] This shows, that the movements and objects of Mr. Clay's *particular* friends were, even then, on the 31st December, 1824, well understood. But what would have been the language of the independent members of the Kentucky Legislature, had they known that almost the only opposition to the resolutions came from Mr. Clay himself? Had Col. Davidson or Mr. Robertson told that body and the country, that Mr. Clay had himself said, that he was already determined to vote for Mr. Adams and against General Jackson, what would have been the language of the Legislature and the freemen of Kentucky? Management had not then effected its object, and he would have been denounced throughout the State, in curses as loud and deep as a betrayed people could utter.

To other members of the Legislature, however, Mr. Clay held a very different language; but it was with a view to the same object. To Major Carneal, who had determined to introduce the resolutions of instruction into the Senate, he stated that "he was *wholly uncommitted*," and "wished to be left entirely free" in giving his vote.—[*See Appendix, No.* 1, *Mr. Carneal's evidence.*] He succeeded in dissuading that gentleman from offering the resolutions, but could not prevail upon him to oppose them, or refuse them his support. To other persons he held similar language, and conveyed to them the impression that his mind was not made up, or that he would vote for General Jackson. This course he pursued with those who, he had reason to believe, were not willing, for the purpose of enabling him to secure a place in the cabinet, to give up their desire for a Western President, and their preference for General Jackson. But in all this double dealing, Mr. Clay's object was single—it was to prevent the adoption of any resolutions of instruction by the Kentucky Legislature.

Having, as he thought, taken effectual measures by his representations to the leaders of each of the local parties, to prevent the expression of any preference by the Legislature of his State, Mr. Clay set out for Washington City. On his arrival, he immediately called on Major Thomas P. Moore, a member of Congress from Kentucky; represented to him that the Kentucky delegation might, with perfect safety and propriety, vote for either of the three candidates, and expressed his desire that his friends should remain uncommitted. To Major R. P. Henry, deceased, he held similar language. The impression conveyed by him to these gentlemen, as well as to Mr. Wickliffe, Major Carneal and others, before he left Kentucky, was, that he himself stood wholly uncommitted, and was ready to vote for either of the three candidates as circumstances might render it expedient. [*See Appendix, No.* 2 & 4.] That he was so understood, by at least one of the Kentucky delegation, who voted with him, has been proved in the Senate of Kentucky. [*See Appendix, No.* 1, *Mr. Kendall's statement.*] After the 4th of January, 1825, Gen. Metcalfe informed one of his constituents, at Washington City, that '*we*,' meaning the Kentucky delegation, including Mr. Clay, "*stand uncommitted.*" He even gave the reason why, at so late a period, Mr. Clay and his friends remained "*uncommitted.*" It was to ascertain "*something about how the cabinet is tobe filled.* [*See Appendix No.* 4, *Mr. John S. Hitt's statement.*] In addition to this, we have Mr. Clay's own declaration to the Hon. John Floyd, late in December, 1824, or early in January, 1825, declaring he was hesitating between Adams and Jackson. He said that, when he "took up the pretensions of Mr. Adams and weighed them, and laid them down, and then took up the pretensions of General Jackson, and weighed them, and laid them down by the side of those of Mr. Adams, he was never so much puzzled in all his life as he was to decide between them. [*See Appendix, No.* 5, *Mr. Floyd's letter.*] When it is considered that Gen. Floyd, decidedly preferred Gen. Jackson as a second choice to Mr. Adams, we confidently ask if Mr. Clay could have possibly assumed an attitude, or expressed himself in language, more distinctly indicating that he was in the market and ready to support General Jackson, upon receiving assurances of promotion? His words seem to have been carefully selected to convey the idea of a tremulous equipoise of judgment, in which the slightest circumstance would incline the balance one way or the other. A more artful stroke, a more profound device of ambidexterous diplomacy, is not to be found in the annals of political intrigue.

Here, then, we have a long series of

acts and declarations of Mr. Clay and his friends, all tending to the same point. The Washington Circular, in May, 1824, advised Mr. Clay's friends to 'adhere to him steadily,' for the purpose of returning him to the House of Representatives, or in case they should fail in that, to enable him and those disposed to act with him '*to control the event.*' The Ohio and Kentucky Circulars tended to the same end. Mr. Clay intrigued to prevent the interference of the Legislature of Kentucky. He advised his friends in Congress, to remain uncommitted. Excepting those who declared for General Jackson, they did remain uncommitted. One of them said, that their object in maintaining that attitude was to ascertain '*how the cabinet was to be filled.*' According to the object avowed early in 1824, Mr. Clay's friends had acquired the power '*by concentration to control the event,*' and were determined to use that power according to the manner in which 'the cabinet was to be filled.' Mr. Clay stood in the midst of a band of *uncommitted friends* with the Presidency in his hand, ready to bestow it according to the dispositions which might be manifested in relation to the cabinet.

While Mr. Clay was standing in this attitude, another obligation was added to those of honor and principle already existing, which forbade his voting for Mr. Adams. It was the obligation of duty to the State of Kentucky. He was one of the constitutional organs designated to speak her voice. It was not Henry Clay and his associates who were to vote for President; it was the State of Kentucky. Henry Clay and his associates were only empowered to give the vote of their State; they had no right to give their own vote. If they preferred one man, and at the same time knew that their State preferred another, it was their duty to vote the preference of their State. Suspecting that her representatives in Congress were inclined to disregard her will, Kentucky, through her sovereign power, declared her choice, and left her delegation in Congress no excuse for disobedience. The following resolutions passed through her Legislature by a vote almost unanimous, and were forwarded to each of her members in the House of Representatives, before the election:

"Whereas, it appears from the result of the elections in the several States, and the formation of the electoral colleges for choosing a President of the United States, that no person will receive a majority of the electoral votes, and that Henry Clay, who was the first choice of the people of Kentucky, has not received a sufficient number of votes to bring him before the House of Representatives, as one of the three highest from whom the choice of the President of the United States is to be made. Therefore,

"*Resolved, &c.*, That the members of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, from this State, be requested to vote for General Andrew Jackson as President of the United States.

"*Resolved, as the opinion of this Legislature,* That General Andrew Jackson is the second choice of the State of Kentucky, for the next President of the United States; that a very large majority of the people of this State prefer General Jackson to Mr. Adams or Mr. Crawford; and that the members of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States will, by complying with the request herein signified, faithfully and truly represent the feelings and wishes of the good people of Kentucky."

Thus was Mr. Clay's obligation to vote against Mr. Adams completed. It was a triple cord, composed of honor, principle, and duty—honor in relation to himself, principle in relation to his own declarations and those of his friends, especially in Ohio, and duty in relation to Kentucky. Yet was this triple cord snapt asunder.

But Mr. Clay seems to have thought it necessary to produce some ground of apology for his abandonment of duty, before he proceeded to the fatal act. There were not wanting certain politicians in Kentucky who were willing to be transferred by him to whomsoever he pleased to sell them, if he could purchase any advantage to himself. Even a few members of the Legislature, and among them one man of high pretensions in Mr. Clay's own congressional district, voted for the resolutions because they dared not openly withstand the voice of the people, and then wrote to Mr. Clay and other members of Congress to pay no regard to them! By some agency which has never been explained, a few of Mr. Clay's constituents in one part of his district, were induced to sign a paper, instructing him to *vote as he pleased.* Unquestionably, his own hand secretly pointed out this movement; it was in accordance with the doctrine of non-committals, which he was then inculcating; it afforded him a poor excuse for disregarding the will of

the State; and the evident object was to enable him 'to control the event' for his own advantage.

How far this kind of management extended, we are unable to say; but, of one other congressional district of Kentucky, we can speak with certainty. It was that which was represented by the Hon. David White. It is probable that Mr. White, when he heard that the Kentucky resolutions were likely to be adopted, intimated that he should feel it his duty to obey them. To impair their obligation upon his mind, and secure his vote, it was necessary that he should be induced to believe that his immediate constituents would prefer a different arrangement. Information was therefore given to some of Mr. Clay's confidential friends in the district, so explicit that it could not be misunderstood, that if Mr. Adams were elected President, he would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State, and Mr. Clay himself wrote to at least one of his friends, urging him, it is believed, to procure letters to Mr. White, instructing him to vote for Mr. Adams, with a view to that arrangement. Those who felt a deep interest in Mr. Clay's advancement, were accordingly told, that Mr. Clay would be Secretary if Mr. Adams was President, and numerous letters were procured to be written by that information. By this intrigue, the obligation of the resolutions was impaired, and the vote of Mr. White was secured for Mr. Adams.

This was a piece of deep management on the part of Mr. Clay. He had failed in so controlling the Legislature, as to prevent the passage of the resolutions. He knew those resolutions accorded with the feelings of the people, and that his views were not to be promoted by calling public meetings and collecting their voice. He therefore secretly endeavored to get a few prominent men, the managers of newspapers and political leaders, committed in favor of his arrangements, and trusted to them and the power and patronage of office, to manage the people into acquiescence.

The election came on. Mr. Clay gave his own vote, and that of Kentucky, for Mr. Adams. He broke the triple cord of honor, principle and duty. He abandoned his principles, deceived Ohio, betrayed Kentucky, and sold the West to her ancient enemy. He voted for one whom he had denounced as one of the basest of his race, a dangerous politician and a vindictive man. He voted for one of the cabinet, whom it was avowed to be *the first object* of his friends to defeat. He voted *for* one whom he had taught Kentucky to hate, and *against* one whom she had called on him, almost by acclamation, to support.

He voted *for* him whom he had charged with attempting to barter the navigation of the Mississippi to Great Britain; *against* him who had defended that river against British armies.

He voted *for* him whom he censured for giving Texas to Spain; *against* him who had saved Louisiana to the Union.

He voted *for* him whom he had charged with "giving our wives and children for fish;" *against* him who had saved the "beauty and booty" of New-Orleans.

He voted *for* him whom he had charged with selling the blood of the west for money; *against* him who preserved the lives of our citizens by an almost bloodless victory.

He voted *for* him whom he had charged with an "unfeeling policy, which would crimson our fresh fields with the blood of our border brethren, and light the midnight forest with the flames of their dwellings;" *against* him who had conquered the savage murderers of our women and children, and who had saved the emporium of the west from all the horrors of a general sack, by a brutal soldiery.

He voted *for* him, who, during the late war, reposed on beds of down, far from his country and from danger, enjoying the society of princes and kings, enriching himself upon outfits, salaries and contingencies drawn from the bankrupt treasury of our bleeding country, and peevishly complaining of our government, as "feeble and penurious;" *against* him who made the boughs of the forest his bed, and fed on its acorns; who spent sleepless nights and days of toil in the face of the enemy; who pledged his own ample fortune to support an army, which his energy had embodied; who, with the voice of confidence and patriotism, made the weak feel strong, and gave courage to the coward; who risked all—fortune, life, and honor—to serve and save his country; conquered the relentless savage, with an inferior force of untrained militia, repelled the disciplined troops of the proud invader, filled America with joy, and the world with admiration.

He voted *for* JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, *against* ANDREW JACKSON! What enchanter's wand or potent spell could have led Mr. Clay so far astray from the duty he owed to himself, his principles, and his

country? What could have induced the eloquent advocate of the late war to prefer his political rival and political enemy to the gallant man who had principally contributed to save him and the other supporters of that war, from disgrace and degradation? His motives cannot be mistaken. In the spring of 1824, measures were already taken to enable him to control the event in the House of Representatives, and his friends were advised, "to adhere to him steadily," for the purpose of giving him the power in that House, if they could not give him the Presidency.

To Messrs. Wickliffe, Carneal, Moore and Floyd, in the fall and winter of that season, he declared that he was *uncommitted*, and urged some of his friends in Congress to assume the same attitude. One of them said, they remained *uncommitted* as late as the 4th or 5th of January, and gave as a reason, that they "must know something about how the cabinet is to be filled." After "distinctly ascertaining that Mr. Adams would appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State," they made up their minds to vote for Mr. Adams. They did vote for Mr. Adams, and Mr. Clay, as had been foretold in Frankfort, Kentucky, early in January, and in this City, late in that month, *was* made Secretary of State. The Kentucky delegates returned home. Mr. F. Johnson was asked by some of his constituents, "how he came to vote for Mr. Adams? Mr. Johnson answered he voted for Mr. Adams, to "*get Mr. Clay made Secretary of State.*" *(See Appendix, No. 1 Mr. McMillan's statement.)* Gen. Metcalfe, on being told that voting for Mr. Adams would be an uphill business in Kentucky, replied, "*I fear we have done too much for our friend.*' *(See Appendix, No. 1, Mr. Johnson's statement.)* After his return home, he said to a constituent, as a reason why he voted for Mr. Adams, "*we could not possibly get Mr. Clay in the cabinet without voting for and electing Mr. Adams.*" *(See Appendix, No. 1.—Mr. Desha's statement.)* Mr. White said, he "*voted for Mr. Clay and not for Mr. Adams;*" that "*Mr. Adams would never have been President if Mr. Clay had not been Secretary of State,*" and that it was the conviction that Mr. Clay would receive that appointment which induced him to vote for Mr. Adams. *(See Appendix, No. 1, Mr. Kendall's statement.)* Mr. David Trimble said, on various occasions, as is proved by numerous witnesses, "*it was distinctly ascertained that Mr. Adams would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State, and that General Jackson would not.*" *(See Appendix, No. 1.)* Mr. J. J. Crittenden, the confidential friend of Mr. Clay, in Frankfort, has admitted in a publication, that he preferred Gen. Jackson to Mr. Adams, but thought that "either of them would make a better President with Mr. Clay associated with him in the Executive Department, than the other without him;" and some weeks before the election, he wrote to Mr. White, requesting him to vote for Mr. Adams.

Combining together these acts and declarations of Mr. Clay and his friends, before and after the Presidential election, no rational man can doubt, that the whole object of their previous management, was to ascertain before-hand, that Mr. Clay would be made Secretary of State, and that this was the *consideration* of their support. It is impossible for any fact to be more conclusively proved, without the productions of a written contract signed and sealed by the contracting parties. How has Mr. Clay attempted to vindicate himself for this abandonment of principle and duty? By a course of bold assertion and artful evasions, unequalled in political history.

To obviate the objection to his voting for Mr. Adams on account of their personal relations, he denies the existence of any hostility between them, and maintains that his whole course towards his rival and enemy, was open and honorable. In his address to his constituents, he thus speaks:

"The relations in which I stood to Mr. Adams, constitute the next theme of this address, which I shall notice. I am described as having assumed "a position of peculiar and decided hostility to the election of Mr. Adams," and expressions towards him, are attributed to me, which I never used. I am made also responsible "for pamphlets and essays of great ability," published by my friends in Kentucky, in the course of the canvass. The injustice of the principle of holding me thus answerable, may be tested by applying it to the case of General Jackson, in reference to publications issued, for example, from the Columbian Observer. That I was not in favor of the election of Mr. Adams when the contest was before the people, is most certain. Neither was I in favor of that of Mr. Crawford or General Jackson. *That I ever did any thing against Mr. Adams*, or either of the other gentlemen, *inconsistent with a fair and honorable compe-*

lition, I utterly deny." He then proceeds to give some account of the Ghent negotiation, quotes his letter of November 16th, 1822, in which he had declared, that Mr. Adams' errors, were, no doubt unintentional," quotes from a speech made by him in 1816, in which he had declared, that his colleagues at Ghent, were "actuated, he believed, by the best of motives," in offering the navigation of the Mississippi for the fishing liberties, recites the mission to London, and thus concludes the subject:

"Now, if I had discovered at Ghent, as has been asserted, that either of them was false and faithless to his country, would I have voluntarily commenced with them another negotiation? Further, there never has been a period, during our whole acquaintance, that Mr. Adams and I have not exchanged, when we met, friendly salutations, and the courtesies and hospitalities of social intercourse."

What! receive "the courtesies and hospitalities of social intercourse" from Mr. Adams, while he was secretly charging him with offences little short of murder and treason? And is all his conduct in the west, the scattering far and wide, with his own hand, and by his own money, these charges against Mr. Adams, while with an affected liberality, he was telling him and the world, that his errors were "*no doubt unintentional*," and that he was "*actuated by the best of motives*," not "*inconsistent with a fair and honorable competition!!*"

This language is not confined to Mr. Clay's address to his constituents. Similar passages may be found in his Lewisburg speech, his Pittsburg speech, his Noble speech, and in his late address to the public. It is unnecessary to make quotations from all these documents: but we cannot refrain from noticing the last. He introduces his copurgator, Mr. David Trimble, to prove that this matter has been much misrepresented. The following is his language:

"I made some reference to the supposed difference of opinion between himself (Mr. Clay) and Mr. Adams about the treaty of Ghent. He said in reply, that it had been greatly magnified by the friends of his competitors for electioneering purposes—that it ought to have no influence in the vote which he might be called upon to give," &c.

If this thing has been "*magnified*," who did it? Who sent the numbers of Wayne to Ohio? Who stimulated the editor of the Frankfort Argus to take up his pen? Who paid his money to have his letters reprinted and circulated in pamphlet, after he knew their contents? Was this "*the friends of his competitors?* Was it for *their* "electioneering purposes?" Let established facts answer.

Has Mr. Clay ever acknowledged to Mr. Adams, and atoned for, his agency in these transactions? Or has it been concealed, until it was dragged out by his own friends in the Senate of Kentucky? When was there a mutual acknowledgment of error and injury? When was the gauntlet, which had been publicly thrown and accepted, withdrawn? When did Mr. Clay retract his charges against Mr. Adams, of hostility to the west, of curtailing her territory, oppressing her people, and selling her blood? When did he say, that Mr. Adams had done him no more than justice in charging him with a sectional course at Ghent, with "bragging a million against a cent," insinuating that he had stimulated Russell's attack and filled the western country with slanders? When did Mr. Adams withdraw *his* charges and insinuations against Mr. Clay, and acknowledge that he had acted with justice, fairness, and honor?

In his speech at Noble's, Mr. Clay says: "*no good or honorable man will do another voluntarily any injustice.*" In his address, he says, "*the obligation to observe the principles of honor, and to speak with scrupulous veracity of all men, and especially of our competitors, is unaffected by time or place.*"

Has Mr. Clay practised his own avowed principles? He publicly declared, that Mr. Adam's errors were "*no doubt unintentional;*" he privately caused to be published, and by his money widely circulated, charges that Mr. Adams' conduct at Ghent, was not only highly censurable, but his errors *doubtless intentional.*

Nor is the situation of Mr. Adams more enviable. His own publications prove that he well knew of Mr. Clay's agency in the attacks upon his conduct and his integrity. By receiving him into his cabinet, he virtually retracts all he had said or insinuated of Mr. Clay, pleads guilty to the charges made against him in the west, and degrades himself. What! Can an honorable man take to his bosom one whom he knows to have treated him most dishonorably, without retraction or atonement?

In what light must "men of honor" view

the President and his Secretary? They must look on them as rank political offenders or mutual slanderers. If they told the truth of each other, they are unworthy of public trust: if they told falsehoods, they deserve neither public trust nor private confidence. In either event, according "to all the laws which govern and regulate the conduct of men of honor," as laid down in Mr. Clay's code, they could never have met in the cabinet. By such men, and according to such laws, it was rather to be expected, that each would *card* the other as "*a base and infamous calumniator, a dastard, and a liar!*"

Strong must have been the inducements which brought these men together.

To justify his abandonment of principle, Mr. Clay says in his address to his constituents, "I saw in his (Mr. Adams) election, the establishment of no dangerous example. I saw in it, on the contrary, only conformity to the safe precedent which had been established in the instances of Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, & Mr. Monroe, who had respectively filled the same office, from which he was to be translated."

All Mr. Clay's friends in the west, with himself at their head, had taken the ground, that the Secretary succession was dangerous to liberty; that it approximated our government to that of imperial Rome, where each emperor appointed his successor: that if the example were followed further, it would always be considered a matter of course to elect the Secretary of State to the Presidency; and that the agency of the people in the election would be but nominal, while the real power of designating the next Chief Magistrate would be in the existing President. Mr. Clay's defence was therefore as extraordinary as it was bold. To place it in its true light, let us contrast it with the Ohio address, adopted in July, 1824:

Ohio Address, 1824.

"Were Mr. Clay 'withdrawn, the result 'as to the election by 'electors would be the 'same; or if it were not, 'it *would place in the* 'Presidential chair, *one* 'of the present cabinet, 'an event which it was 'the first object of the 'friends of Mr. Clay to 'prevent; not in refer-'ence to the men but 'to the principle."

Mr. Clay, 1825.

"I saw in Mr. Ad-'ams' election, the es-'tablishment of *no dan-'gerous example.* I saw 'in it, on the con-'trary, only conformi-'ty to *the safe precedent* 'which had been estab-'lished in the instan-'ces of Mr. Jefferson, 'Mr. Madison and Mr. 'Monroe, who had re-'spectively filled the 'same office from 'which he was to be 'translated."

The Ohio address was adopted by a meeting of 300 of Mr. Clay's friends, from every part of the State, of which *Joseph Vance* was Chairman, and *Samuel Potts* Secretary. Mr. Clay was certainly very bold, when, after defeating their "FIRST OBJECT" by placing "*in the presidential chair one of the present cabinet,*" he turned round, and told them, it was but "*conformity to a safe precedent!*" It was relying much on his friends to demand of them, for his sake, to turn round and pronounce that '*safe*' which they had denounced as '*dangerous*,' and struggle to perpetuate a Secretary succession, which it had been their '*first object*' to prevent. It was saying to them, that their principles were assumed to suit the occasion; that, to promote his interest, they would urge one argument to-day and its opposite to-morrow; that they were *his*, soul, body and principles, created and destined, like the serfs of a Russian noble, to live for his use, to think as he thinks, to act as he directs, renounce their opinions at his bidding, and shout hosannas to any administration with which it pleases him to form an alliance. It remains to be seen, whether his friends in Ohio, after being cheated by him out of their "first object," have shuffled off their old principles as readily as he has, and are so devoted to men, that they will sanction his act, re-elect Mr. Adams, and support a Secretary of State as his successor! When the people shall prove to be thus supple and unprincipled, we may look for the speedy extinction of our liberal institutions. *Civil Chieftains*, profligate and corrupt, will transfer whole States and sections of the Union, to this man or that, according to their own will; and the people, instead of instructing and controlling men in power, will stand ready to do the bidding of their political leaders.

That Mr. Clay in his vote for Mr. Adams, abandoned a principle which he had long professed to cherish, and adopted its opposite, is notorious to the world; but neither the people of Ohio or any other State, will follow the profligate example. They are warned to beware, not only by the admonitions of reason, but by the effect already produced by our *precedents* on men and countries which look to us for example and instruction. Like Mr. Clay, President Bolivar thinks it a 'safe precedent' to suffer the Chief Magistrate to appoint his successor, and in the constitution given by him to Bolivia he has conferred on the executive that power without the formality of confirmation by the people, and referred to the example of the United States to sustain the principle! It therefore becomes the people of the U. States, as they value

their own liberty, and that of other nations, to break up the cabinet succession, assert their own right to select their Chief Magistrate, and teach aspiring politicians that they are not to expect to reach the Presidency by bargaining for the office of Secretary of State.

What excuse does Mr. Clay give for his dereliction of *duty* in voting against the known will of his State? His first apology was, that the Legislature of Kentucky had no right to instruct him, and the only instruction received from any portion of his immediate constituents was, *to vote as he pleased*. In his address to his constituents, he says: "I did not recognise the right, therefore, of the Legislature to instruct me. I recognised that right only when exerted by you." In that document and his subsequent discussions, Mr. Clay admitted that he would have been bound by instructions emanating from his immediate constituents.

But what have we in his late address? A complete declaration of independence, not of Kentucky only, but even of his immediate constituents! He first showed himself sensible of the obligatory force of Legislative instructions, by intriguing to prevent their being given. After they were given, he denied their obligation, and maintained that nobody but his immediate constituents had a right to instruct him. Now it has become necessary for him to show, that he had in the fall of 1824, made up his mind to vote for Mr. Adams against General Jackson, and he comes out and declares, and even *proves* that he had determined to vote as he pleased, regardless of *all* instructions, whether from the Legislature or his constituents! The following quotations from his late address, will make this act sufficiently apparent.

Page 15, he says, "this testimony establishes that, on various occasions and times, beginning in Kentucky as early as about the 1st October, 1824, and continued in the City of Washington, down to the period when my determination to vote for Mr. Adams was generally known in this City, I uniformly expressed my conviction of General Jackson's want of qualification, and my *fixed resolution not to vote for him*, if I were called upon to give a vote." In page 17, he says, "so *unalterably fixed* was my *resolution* prior to my departure from Kentucky." In page 20, he says: "Here, then, is an unbroken chain of testimony, commencing early in October, 1824, and extending to nearly the end of the year, establishing beyond all controversy, my *fixed* and *unwavering decision not to vote for General Jackson*." By Mr. Trimble he proves, that in October 1824, he said, "that he could not, consistently with his principles, vote for Gen. Jackson under any possible circumstances." By Col. Davidson he proves, that he said, "I cannot *conceive* of *any event which can possibly happen*, which *could induce me to support the election of Gen. Jackson to the Presidency.*" By Mr. Crittenden he proves, that he said he *could not*, or that *it was impossible for him* to vote for General Jackson in any event." He proves similar expressions by Mr. Johnson, Mr. Bouligny, the Secretary of War, and Gen. Lafayette.

If Mr. Clay had boldly taken this ground at first, it would have saved him and the people much trouble. When asked why he disregarded the voice of Kentucky, in voting for Mr. Adams against Gen. Jackson, he had only to say, as he does now, "THE REASON IS MY WILL;" as early as October, 1824, I had taken a "*fixed resolution*"—my resolution was "*unalterably fixed*"—I had come to a "*fixed and unwavering decision*" not "*in any event*" or "*under any possible circumstances*," to vote for General Jackson. Yes, Henry Clay *proves* that his reason was that of the despot—"MY WILL." It was not to be changed by the voice of his constituents, nor the voice of Kentucky, nor by the voice of the free millions of America. It was "*fixed*," "*unalterable*."

Surely Mr. Clay is insane. He is not monarch of Kentucky nor of America. His will is not our law, nor has he a right to dispose of our destinies. For whom was he acting? Did not Kentucky place him in Congress to speak her voice? Was he not bound to do her will, and vote according to her bidding? By what right, therefore, in October 1824, did he form a "*fixed*" and "*unalterable*" resolution not to vote for General Jackson? Power has made him proud. He once obeyed the people; now the people must obey him. His will is to govern; not theirs. He willed in October, 1824, that General Jackson should not have the vote of Kentucky: the people willed, in December, that he should. Mr. Clay's will prevailed. After deluding the people with various excuses and apologies, in long addresses and speeches, for three years, he now comes boldly out, and says, I did it because it was my "*fixed*" and "*unalterable*" will!

Well, on what ground does our *Autocrat* rest, to vindicate the expediency of his choice? He says Mr. Adams is well qualified for the Presidency, and General Jackson wholly unqualified. Presump-

tuous man! He thought *himself* well qualified, and offered for that office. The people, deciding between him and Gen. Jackson, gave him 37 votes, and General Jackson 99! Yet Mr. Clay says Gen. Jackson is not qualified! The Legislature of Kentucky, by a vote almost unanimous, requested him to vote for Jackson. Yet Mr. Clay says General Jackson is not qualified! The people of Kentucky, five to one, preferred Gen. Jackson to Adams: Yet Mr. Clay says General Jackson is not qualified! New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Kentucky, two-thirds of the Union, proclaim Jackson as our next President: Yet Mr. Clay says General Jackson is not qualified! *Autocrat*, as he claims to be, ought not his own diminutive vote, the declarations of his own State, the voice of millions who yet aspire to be free, to teach him a little modesty in declaring and acting upon his own opinions, as to Gen. Jackson's want of qualifications? But if he admits that he acted as the Representative of the people, in the election, what right had he to set up his opinion of Gen. Jackson's qualifications against theirs?*

When Kentucky told him that General Jackson was her second choice, and requested him so to vote, what right had he to turn round and tell her, "*I will not do it—you know nothing about it—Jackson is wholly unqualified for the office—I have long since come to a fixed and unalterable resolution not to vote for him?*" Does such language become a republican, a servant of the people? Shall such conduct pass with impunity? If it does, let the people change their Constitution, abolish the election of President, and let the Secretary of State be his successor. Mr. Clay will have had an advantage over all those who have come in or may come in by virtue of "the safe precedent." He has already forced on us one President, as his predecessor, and when President himself, he will give us another as his successor.

But is it possible that Mr. Clay could believe General Jackson worse qualified for the presidency than he has asserted Mr. Adams to be, in the charges circulated with his own hand, and by his own money? Was General Jackson worse qualified than the man who was guilty of "*bearing false witness against his neighbor*," of "*weighing dollars against blood*," of attempting "*to make the western people pay an exclusive tax of rivalship, war, and blood, for the security of those fishermen who frequent British waters.*" of "*manufacturing facts*," of gross "*absurdities, inconsistencies, and contradictions*," of possessing "*views too narrow, feelings too sectional, and a temper too vindictive, for the Chief Magistrate of a free people?*" In short, is it possible that any man could be worse qualified for the office of President, than Mr. Adams, according to the charges scattered far and wide by Mr. Clay himself?

---

* Mr. Scott of Missouri, one of the representatives who voted for Mr. Adams, and at the same time acknowledged that nineteen-twentieths of the people of his State preferred Gen. Jackson, (see Appendix, Mr. Brown's statement) thus expressed himself on the subject:

"You are apprized, fellow citizens, that within my present term of service, should the election of President come before the House of Representatives, it is my bounden duty, and exalted privilege, to have a voice in that election. The occasion wherein this question would have influenced you in electing me, who now offers to represent you in Congress, is past, is done, and cannot be undone. If your confidence is misplaced, as some would have you believe, it is now irremediable. But to satisfy you who have confided to me this important trust, and before whom I appear a candidate to represent you in the nineteeth Congress, I feel a willingness and desire, when all motive to conceal is past, to express, in this public address, my course on this momentous subject. In such event (provided the election of electors is made by the people) I have two votes to give, one for an elector of President, another for a President; the first as a citizen of Missouri, the latter as the Representative of Missouri; one in this State, the other in the House of Representatives. In giving the former, my wishes being such as may be reasonably supposed to be entertained by a western man. I shall be governed by individual feelings, corrected by my best judgment. In giving the latter, I become the organ of the people, and the expressed will of the people will be my guide. I vote not as a citizen of Missouri, but as the representative of Missouri; the vote belongs to the people, and not to me; and the voice of Missouri, will, in such case, as far as practicable, be the voice of her representative. Those were my principles in 1822, and such are my principles in 1824, and such shall be my vote in the hall of the House Representatives on the election of President, come when it may."

In speaking of the declarations he had made relative to "Gen. Jackson's want of qualification," page 15, he says: "These sentiments, long cherished, were deliberately expressed to gentlemen of the highest respectability, most of them my personal and particular friends, in all of whose estimation I must have stood dishonored, if I had voted for Gen. Jackson, contrarily to my declared purpose." These declarations of opinion were *privately* made, like his attacks on Mr. Adams. Now, let the world judge whether he did not, in the same clandestine manner, express and circulate opinions detracting a thousand times more from the qualifications of Mr. Adams, and whether, in voting for him, he does not, upon his own principles, "*stand dishonored*," not only in the estimation of his personal friends, but of the whole world? If the charges were true, he "*stands dishonored*" for having voted for a man so wicked and depraved, so destitute of principle, and so unfitted in temper to be the Chief Magistrate of a free people. If they were not true, he "*stands dishonored*" for having given them countenance and circulation, and then cringing to receive an office from the hand of the man whom he had grossly *libelled*.

It is impossible that Mr. Clay could have thought worse of the qualifications of General Jackson than he did of those of Mr. Adams. Nor, whatever might have been his own opinions, could he have stood half as much "*dishonored*" in voting for General Jackson, in accordance with the wishes of Kentucky, as he does in having voted for Mr. Adams, against those wishes, and then accepting an office at his hands.

We do not doubt that Mr. Clay used the expressions which he has so successfully labored to prove; but we do doubt whether, in reality, he had come to any fixed and unwavering resolution, as early as October, November, or December. To whom was it made known? Col. Davidson did not state it to the Senate of Kentucky; George Robertson did not declare it to the House of Representatives; nor did J. J. Crittenden proclaim it to the people. So carefully and confidentially had it been communicated, that the zephyrs had not heard it; the birds of the air had not whispered it; political jealousy had not suspected it. No man lisped it in Kentucky, or breathed it in Washington City. In his address to his constituents, Mr. Clay says: "During the month of December, and the greater part of January, strong professions of high consideration and of unbounded admiration of me, were made to my friends, in the greatest profusion, by some of the active friends of all the returned candidates." "I knew the sunbeams would quickly disappear, after *my opinion should be ascertained*, and that they would be succeeded by a storm," &c. He proceeds to narrate events until the appearance of Mr. Kremer's letter, and "*I issued my Card.*" In his speech at Noble's, he labors to prove that his determination to vote for Mr. Adams was not publicly announced or known at Washington, until near the end of January. If, therefore, he had declared, "about the 1st of October, 1824," that he was already unalterably resolved to vote for Mr. Adams, against General Jackson, it was kept a profound secret until near the end of January, 1825.

In his late Address, page 20, Mr. Clay says: "There does not exist a human being, and if the dead could be recalled, one could not be summoned from the grave who could truly testify, that I ever expressed or ever insinuated the remotest intention to vote for General Jackson, in any contingency whatever." Again: page 29, he says: "Not a particle of opposing testimony has been, or with truth can be, adduced. I have, indeed, derived consolation from the reflection that, amidst all the perturbation of the times, no man has been yet found hardy enough to assert that I ever signified a purpose of voting for General Jackson."

We have ample evidence that Mr. Clay did, notwithstanding these bold assertions, say to several gentlemen of as sterling honor as any that live, after October, 1824, that his mind was not made up, and did convey the impression that he might ultimately vote for General Jackson. This he did to the Hon. C. A. Wickliffe, in October, to Major Thomas D. Carneal, in November, to the Hon. Thos. P. Moore, in December, to the Hon. John Floyd, in December or January, and to other persons known to the Committee, whose statements have not yet been received. —It may be, that he did not say he would vote for General Jackson, in so many words, but he represented that he was uncommitted; that he was hesitating between Mr. Adams and General Jackson; that the Kentucky delegation could vote for either with entire safety and perfect propriety; and he left the impression that he would as soon vote for the one as the other, and was to be determined by future

contingencies. Moreover, in his address to his constituents, after this election, he informs them of the deliberation which it cost him to make up his mind, after he found himself excluded from the House of Representatives. This fact, he informed them, was not known to him until the 20th December, 1824. He says: "I found myself transformed from a candidate before the people, into an Elector for the people. I *deliberately examined the duties incident to this new attitude, and weighed all the facts before me*, upon which *my judgment was to be formed or reviewed.*" Yet, notwithstanding all this grave deliberation, he now says his mind was unalterably made up not to vote for General Jackson, almost three months before!! Again, he says: "I will, for the present, leave him (Mr. Kremer) and proceed to assign the reasons to you, to whom alone I admit myself to be officially responsible, for the vote which I gave on the presidential election. The *first inquiry* which it behooved me to make was, as to the influence which ought to be exerted on my judgment by the relative state of the electoral votes which the three returned candidates brought into the House from the electoral colleges. Gen. Jackson obtained 99, Mr. Adams 84, and Mr. Crawford 41." He then enters into a long argument to show why Gen. Jackson's plurality ought not to have been conclusive on his "*judgment.*" Here was a man, after the 20th December, 1824, entering into an "*inquiry*" how far General Jackson's plurality of votes ought not to influence his "*judgment.*" Now, what was the use of all this, if he had made up his mind the preceding October, not to vote for him "*under any circumstances?*"

Again, he says: "With these views of the relative state of the vote with which the three returned candidates entered the House, I proceeded to examine the other considerations which belonged to the question." Still *considering*, though his mind was made up two or three months before!!

Again: "It appeared to me, then, that sooner or later, we must come to the only practical issue of the contest before us, and that was between Mr. Adams and General Jackson, and I thought the earlier we got there the better for the country and for the House." In considering this only alternative, I was not unaware of your strong desire to have a Western President," &c. He then goes into a long detail of the argument he held with himself in relation to the claims and qualifications of these two candidates, although, as he now says, he had irrevocably made up his mind between them, before he went to Washington City!

Again: "A collateral consideration of much weight, was derived from the wishes of the Ohio delegation. A majority of them, during the progress of the session, made up their opinions to support Mr. Adams, and they were communicated to me. They said 'Ohio supported the candidate who was the choice of Kentucky. We failed in our common exertions to secure his election. Now, among those returned, we have a decided preference, and we think you ought to make some *sacrifice* to gratify us.' Was not much due to our neighbor and friend?" What does this mean, but that the wishes of the Ohio delegation had some influence upon Mr. Clay, in the formation of his opinion? Their opinion was formed and communicated to him "*during the progress of the session*," or after the first Monday in December. Yet, he now says he had irrevocably made up his mind the preceding October, and this "*collateral consideration of much weight*," had *no weight at all!* There is little doubt, that in reality Mr. Clay had made up his mind before the Ohio delegation, and that *his* wishes operated as a "collateral consideration of much weight" *with them*. How it was that General Vance and his associates were induced to support one of Mr. Monroe's cabinet, whose election it was their "*first object*" to prevent, has never been satisfactorily explained. Circumstances make it quite evident that Mr. Clay found the members of that delegation sufficiently pliant to give up their "*first object*," and all their avowed principles for his advancement, and having first secured their adhesion, he made use of them as "a collateral consideration of much weight," to bring Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri into his views.

The Secretary further says: "I considered, with the greatest respect, the resolutions of the General Assembly of Kentucky, requesting the delegation to vote for General Jackson." Still *considering*, although he now says he had made up his mind unchangeably, months before!!

Almost his whole address to his constituents is made up of the arguments he says he used with himself after he was "transformed from a candidate before the people, into an elector for the people," to enable him to decide between

the contending candidates. Yet, he has now endeavored to prove that elaborate document, a tissue of hypocrisy and deception, by showing that he had unalterably resolved before he left Kentucky the preceding fall, to vote against General Jackson, without regard to the state of the electoral vote, the wishes of the Ohio delegation, the resolutions of the Legislature or the will of his constituents! All these apologies he would now have considered as *after thoughts* invented for the purpose of reconciling a discontented people to the previous decisions of his own *imperial will.*

The apologies made to his constituents, after the election, were in coincidence with many of his declarations and all his his acts previous to the latter part of the preceding January. He told Messrs. Carneal Wickliffe, Moore, and Floyd, that he was uncommitted, and hesitating at different periods between the first of October and the first of January; and General Metcalfe said he was uncommitted as late as the 4th of the latter month. By the public, Mr. Clay was understood to remain uncommitted, as late as the 20th of that month. Under these circumstances, who is there that can possibly believe that Mr. Clay had made up his mind unalterably to vote against General Jackson, as early as October, 1824?

However, nothing is more likely than that Mr. Clay expected to vote for Mr. Adams from the moment he anticipated his own exclusion from the House. He is a good judge of human character. He knew Mr. Adams to be a cold, calculating diplomatist, whose principles are subservient to his ambition or his avarice. Standing uncommitted, with the Presidency in his hand, he knew, that from such a man, he could obtain any price for it, which he might demand. The firm patriotism and stern integrity of General Jackson, were also well known to him. There was little ground to hope from him the promise of any favor or advancement, in consideration of his support. It is, therefore, very probable, that even in October, 1824, he expected in the end to vote for Mr. Adams, and declared such an intention to his *confidential* friends. He thus made evidence for himself, which he now finds it very convenient to call forth. But had he found it his interest to vote for General Jackson, these declarations would never have been heard of. On the contrary, had his motives in giving such a vote, been called in question, he could have proved by Messrs. Carneal Moore, Wickliffe, and Floyd, by all his public conduct, by the wishes of Kentucky, and the resolutions of her Legislature, that he had not only anticipated such a course, but that it was strictly conformable to every republican principle. He was, therefore, well prepared for a vindication on either side, while his *real object* was to ascertain how the cabinet was to be filled, and vote accordingly.

But if Mr. Clay had made up his mind unalterably to vote against General Jackson, as early as October, 1824, and was playing the hypocrite with the General's friends, in the Legislature and in Congress, what will that avail him? Will his acknowledgment that he was guilty of prevarication and hypocrisy, acquit him of bargain and corruption? Not at all. Whatever may have been the secret purposes of his mind, he maintained the same mysterious bearing towards Mr. Adams and his friends, that he did towards the other candidates. All had hopes, but none understood him. In his address to his constituents, he says; "During the month of December, and the greater part of January, strong professions of high consideration and of unbounded admiration of me, were made to my friends, in the greatest profusion, by *some of the active friends of* ALL *the returned candidates.* None were so reserved as those of Mr. Adams" &c. Hence, according to his own showing, the friends of Mr. Adams, were not apprized of his unalterable resolution, formed in October, until near the end of January.

Why did Mr. Clay so long conceal his unwavering determination from Mr. Adams and his friends? Why did he remain so long uncommitted as to them? We have still the same answer, in the language of General Metcalfe, it was "to know something about how the cabinet was to be filled." As soon as that point was settled, as soon as, in the language of Mr. Trimble, he "ascertained that Mr. Adams would make him Secretary of State," and the western States had been brought into the arrangement; then, and not till then, was the disguise thrown off, and his unalterable decision made known to the friends of Mr. Adams and to the public. Even, therefore, if he had made up his mind, it was just as much a bargain as if he had not. Nay, it was worse than a bargain; it was a bargain founded upon a corrupt consideration, extorted by false pretences. Mr. Clay acknowledges that he considered it his

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published, weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, MAY 10, 1828. No. 12

duty to *give* his vote to Mr. Adams; and yet, he took advantage of the necessities of Mr. Adams, and compelled him to *pay for it.* He would not agree to give it, until he "distinctly ascertained" "how the cabinet was to be filled." He exacted for it the office of Secretary of State, with a reversionary interest in the Presidency. He insisted on being designated by the President as his successor, the heir apparent by "safe precedent."

It cannot be necessary to examine, in detail, the evidence which Mr. Clay has adduced to prove his innocence. It chiefly consists of letters of expurgation from those members of Congress, who participated with him in the outrages committed on the rights of the people. If these men are admitted to be witnesses in favor of themselves and of each other, then may any combination of culprits swear themselves innocent, one by one. If Mr. Metcalfe and Mr. Trimble are competent witnesses for Mr. Clay, then Mr. Clay is a competent witness for them; and each of the delinquent members of Congress may, in his turn, bring in all the rest to prove his purity. These letters are the tales of well drilled witnesses, who have all been trained to tell the same story. They testify in their own case, without oath or cross examination. Proof that one has testified falsely, discredits the whole. Hence, in the ample refutation we have given of the ground assumed by Mr. Clay, we have shown the fallacy of all the evidence he has embodied in his defence.

However, we feel inclined to examine the principal positions assumed by one of his testifying accomplices, not because he has told less truth than the rest, but merely as a specimen of the whole. For this purpose, we have selected Mr. David Trimble. In his letter published in Mr. Clay's late Address, speaking of his own previous intentions, he says:

"It is enough to say, without dwelling upon matters concerning myself, that I concluded as early as February, 1824, to vote for Mr. Adams as a second choice, in the event of Mr. Clay's exclusion from the House," &c. Lest, as he had good reason to apprehend, the world should doubt his word on this point, he introduces a letter from Judge Trimble, stating that his "intention had been expressed to him at that time."

Remember, this was at the City of Washington, in the month of February, 1824. Mr. Trimble returned home, and became a candidate for re-election to Congress. Now let us hear what language he held to his constituents about Mr. Adams, after, as he says, he had made up his mind to vote for him as a second choice:

"*Joseph Secrest*, a member of the House of Representatives, stated that he heard Mr. David Trimble say, in a speech or speeches, made in 1824, that John Quincy Adams was a noted federalist; that he was inimical to the west, and wanted to sell to the British the navigation of the Mississippi."

Jesse Summers, Esq. formerly a member of the Kentucky House of Representatives, states, that Trimble "represented John Q. Adams to be a dangerous man, and an enemy to the western country. He said, that Adams had voted at the treaty of Ghent, to give up the navigation of the Mississippi to the British for a mess of codfish."

Richard R. Lee, Tarpley Taylor, Charles Spencer, Mordecai Williams, T. W. Jones, E. B. Early, William Shockley, Aquila Thompson, Jesse Summers, John Taylor, and *James Alexander*, all of them respectable citizens of Fleming county, Kentucky, and several of them at different times members of the Kentucky Legislature, state, that "they heard David Trimble say, in a speech on the court-house steps, in Flemingsburg, that the elder John Adams was the most dangerous man in Government, in his day, and that young John Q. Adams was a chip of the old block; if any odds, worse; that in the treaty at Ghent, he wanted to barter away the navigation of the Mississippi, the key-stone of the western country, for a mess of codfish; that he was always considered an apostate federalist: that he always had been hostile to the west; and that we never will have an equal chance with the eastern people.

until we get a western President; that we now have a chance in the west, for we have two candidates for the Presidency; and that he thought Henry Clay was the strongest; and if we could not get him, we have another chance in the west, to wit, General Jackson."

John Mason, Jr. Esq. formerly a member of the Kentucky Legislature, testifies that "Trimble told him, in September, 1824, that he knew Adams to be an apostate federalist: and that if he ever voted for him, witness might call him a federalist as long as he lived. He also said, that Adams had agreed to give up the navigation of the Mississippi river for whales and mackerel, and that he, Adams, had always been an enemy to the west."

Is it possible, that as early as February, 1824, Mr. Trimble had determined to vote, as a second choice, for this "*apostate federalist*," this "*enemy of the west*," this "*worse*" politician than old John Adams, the "*most dangerous man in the Government in his day*," this man who proposed at Ghent "*to give up the navigation of the Mississippi for a mess of codfish?*" Is it possible, that while he was holding this language to his constituents, he cherished in his breast a secret resolution to vote, as his second choice, for the very man he was denouncing? Is it possible, that he could have told them "we have another choice in the west, viz: General Jackson," and at the same time, have made up his mind to prefer Mr. Adams? This beats Mr. Clay. He abused Mr. Adams first, and made up his mind to vote for him *afterwards;* but Mr. Trimble *first* makes up his mind to vote for him, and afterwards abuses him through a whole electioneering campaign! Mr. Clay set out to prove that he had determined to vote for Mr. Adams in October, 1824; whereas Mr. Trimble states that he had come to the same determination eight months before!

It is impossible to believe that Mr. Trimble had made up his mind to vote for Mr. Adams, under any circumstances, while he was thus reviling him, and speaking of General Jackson as the second choice of the west; while he was telling his constituents, that if he voted for this same Adams, they "*might call him a federalist as long as he lived.*" Is it true that he was so profound a hypocrite? Are we not bound, in charity to *him*, to believe that it was not until he began to practise the doctrine of *non-committal*, for the purpose of "ascertaining how the cabinet was to be filled;" that he learnt the art of an able diplomatist, and acquired the habit of saying one thing, while he is thinking another? But whether he told the truth to his constituents, or tells it now, what credit ought to be attached to such testimony?

In this letter, Mr. Trimble further says, "I do not know, nor do I believe, that Mr. Adams or his friends, made overtures or offers, directly or indirectly, to Mr. Clay or his friends, to make him Secretary of State, if he or his friends would unite in aid of the election of Mr. Adams; nor do I know or believe that any pledge, or promise of any kind, was made by Mr. Adams or his friends, to Mr. Clay or his friends, to procure his aid in the election."

Now let us see how Mr. Trimble's first declarations, after he returned home, agree with these assertions.

John Mason, jr. testifies, that "he had a conversation with him, (Trimble,) about his vote, in which he gave as his reasons, that 'we ascertained if Mr. Adams was made President, Mr. Clay would be made Secretary of State, and that if General Jackson was made President, Mr. Clay would not be made Secretary; and that it would be better for us to have Adams with Mr. Clay Secretary, than General Jackson without him.' "

Micajah Harrison, Esq. states, that the Hon. David Trimble observed to me, "*we*, (meaning, as I supposed, the Kentucky delegation,) had *distinctly* ascertained, that if Mr. Adams were elected President, Mr. Clay would be appointed his Secretary of State; and that, if Gen. Jackson were elected President, Mr. Clay would not."

Mr. *Albert G. Harrison* says:

"On the evening of Major David Trimble's return to Mount Sterling, from Congress, after the election of Mr. Adams as President, he came to my house, and sat with me and my family until usual bed-time. In the course of the evening, the subject of the Presidential election came up. He inquired of me, how the people were pleased with the President, and with the vote of Kentucky upon that occasion? I replied, that the people, so far as I knew, were much dissatisfied, and that many who before had been Mr. Clay's warm personal and political friends, had now determined to forsake him for ever. I told him that, for one, I had resolved never to vote for Mr. Clay again, for any office. The cause of dissatisfaction with the people, I informed him, seemed to be, that Mr. Clay and a majority of the Kentucky delegation, had given the vote of Kentucky to Mr. Adams, when the people were notoriously in favor of General Jackson. To this, he replied, that as things had turned out, Kentucky was almost in as good a situation, as if Mr. Clay

had been elected. That they ascertained that General Jackson would not appoint Mr. Clay, but Mr. Adams his Secretary, and that Mr. Adams, if elected, would give the appointment to Mr. Clay; and that thus arranged, the West would derive as much advantage from Mr. Clay's being Secretary, and Mr. Adams President, as if Mr. Clay himself were the President.

"Besides, Major Trimble attempted to show me the further advantages that would result from the union of Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay. He said that the East and the West had always been divided in feeling, interest, and politics; that the East had the ascendancy over us; looked upon us with a jealous eye, and would, as she always had done, oppose us in our wishes and interest, if the union had not taken place; that by it we had secured the balance of power, and so amalgamated the interests of the two sections as certainly to command the influence and strength of the East, whenever desired; that the election of our friend Mr. Clay as President, which, without the union, was highly problematical, was now rendered almost certain, after Mr. Adams's time should have expired!!"

Jesse Summers, Esq. states, that "I have heard Mr. David Trimble say, it was ascertained that, if John Q. Adams was elected President, he would appoint Henry Clay Secretary of State; and he also stated, in all probability, if General Jackson was elected he would not."

Jacob Frizzel, Henry Halbert, David C. Heath, William Coffrin, Richard Pell, John Kendrick, Jesse Hamrick, John Griffith, William Hamblin, William Davis, Hezekiah Griffith, and *David Tonkry,* respectable citizens of Lewis county, Kentucky, state on their oaths, that Trimble said in a speech at Lewis Court house, in October, 1825, that "when *we* went on last fall to the City of Washington, we found Mr. Crawford out of the question; the contest was between General Jackson and John Quincy Adams; we ascertained that, under no circumstances, would General Jackson appoint our friend, Henry Clay, Secretary of State; we ascertained that Mr. Adams would appoint our friend, Henry Clay, Secretary of State."

P. M. Savage and *A. Duke,* also respectable citizens of Lewis county, confirm the foregoing statement.

Mr. Trimble's confession, that he ascertained that Mr. Adams would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State, and voted for him on that account, is thus proved by EIGHTEEN unimpeachable witnesses, and we doubt not the number might be augmented to *one hundred.*

How could this have been 'ascertained,' if neither Mr. Adams nor his friends ever made any overture or promise to that effect, either directly or indirectly?

So conscious was Mr. Trimble that this declaration involved the proof of a promise on the part of Mr. Adams, that, instead of attempting any explanation, he authorized, through the National Intelligencer, an informal denial of the assertions now proved to have been made by him at Lewis Court House! What aid can such a witness afford to the cause of Mr. Clay? Out of his own mouth he stands convicted of hypocrisy and falsehood.

Mr. Trimble, and others of Mr. Clay's witnesses, as well as Mr. Clay himself, now pretend to have voted for Mr. Adams on account of his known attachment to the Tariff and Internal Improvements, and against General Jackson on account of his hostility to those interests.

A more shallow artifice was never invented. Never to this day has Mr. Adams avowed himself in favor of Internal Improvements on the principles maintained by Mr. Clay. On the contrary, in a letter to a gentleman in Maryland, in 1824, he declared himself in favor of making roads and canals, *with the consent of the States,* and a reservation of their territorial jurisdiction. Nor has he ever, to this day, in any manner or form, avowed himself in favor of a Tariff. Although his own supporters, out of Congress, have been loud in demanding an increase of duty on certain imports as necessary to save our manufactories from utter ruin, he has never recommended any such measure in any one of his messages. On the other hand, at the very moment Mr. Trimble says he made up his mind to vote for Mr. Adams on account of his devotion to these interests, the Tariff of 1824 was before Congress, of which General Jackson was a member. In every step of the progress of this bill before the Senate he voted for it, and it is believed that, without his aid, it would not have passed. He also voted in favor of every measure of Internal Improvement which was presented while he was a member of the Senate. That any person voted for Mr. Adams because he was known to be more devoted to those interests than Gen. Jackson, is, therefore, wholly untrue. The tale was invented to operate on the middle and western States, with the object of bringing them, by an artful and deceptious appeal to their interests, into the support of a wicked coalition. But it has been found impossible to persuade the people out of that which they know —to make them believe that Jackson,

who voted for these measures, is their enemy, or that he will neglect any interest of that country, which he has hazarded his life and fortune to defend.

We appeal to the people of the United States, and invoke them, by all the considerations which bind them to love and protect the civil institutions of the only free government on earth, to examine into the facts which we have adduced, and ponder over the consequences which will necessarily flow from the re-election of Mr. Adams. Gen. Jackson is the last of those Revolutionary worthies, who, by eminent public services, has attained the high distinction, without which no one can successfully become a candidate for the Presidency. We are entering upon a new race of public men; another description of service is relied upon for office; and, from the nature of things, we may expect many competitors for the Presidency. We have seen that Mr. Clay continued a candidate, after his partisans had openly avowed that he could not be elected by the people. We have seen him, whilst the election was pending before the people, advocated upon the ground that it was the first object of his friends to defeat the election of Mr. Adams; not so much in relation to the man, as to the principle—to prevent the election of one of Mr. Monroe's Cabinet. And we have seen these two men—opposed in feelings, in interests, and in principles—reconciling their mutual differences, and bestowing the two highest offices of the people upon each other; boldly declaring the open violation of the public will to be a "*safe* precedent." We have seen the partisans of these men, in Congress, defeat a proposition, the object of which was so to amend the Constitution as to take the election of President from the House of Representatives, and place it with the people. With these things before our eyes, we should be wilfully blind, if we did not foresee that, unless the people unite their strength, and break down the line of precedents, it will be easy for a few leading public men, in different sections of the United States, to bring before the people so many candidates, as, at all times, to defeat an election of President, except by the House of Representatives. To prevent such combinations of political leaders, and to elect a President who will stand pledged to aid in obtaining this salutary amendment, is an object of first importance. Gen. Jackson is so pledged. It was in his person that the will of the people was violated; and [illegible] to themselves to rescue the nation from impending danger, by his election. If the people, now, in the youthful vigor of our institutions, under such circumstances, cannot rally upon such a candidate as ANDREW JACKSON, there will be an end of the elective franchise. Public men will no longer look to the people as the source of political elevation: they will look to the National Treasury. And instead of a host of patriots, ready to defend the national independence with their lives, we shall have a host of greedy political speculators, whose chief aim will be to cheat the people of political power, regardless of the means by which it is attained.

Again—we say, if the people cannot resist the power and patronage of the Government, with such a candidate as ANDREW JACKSON—who will be bold enough, hereafter, to look to the people for office?

The present contest is not a contest between Andrew Jackson and John Quincy Adams. It is a contest between the people on one side, and corrupt political managers, who, having seized upon the influence and patronage of the Government, seek to continue themselves in office by subverting the elective franchise, by bidding for the votes of the people, as for merchandise in the open market, on the other. Suspicions of the corrupt practices of the public functionaries are deeply seated in the public mind. A people, to preserve their liberty, must be jealous and watchful. If the present incumbents are re-elected, they will be elected by the power and influence of the patronage of the Government, and they will stand pledged to continue the abuses which have gradually crept into the administration of the Government. If Gen. Jackson be elected, he will come into office as the President of the People; selected by them for the purpose of correcting abuses, and removing from office unworthy public servants. He has been tried in many emergencies, and never yet has been found wanting. Those who have abused the public confidence, and squandered the public money, will appeal in vain to the sympathies of Andrew Jackson. In every public station he has made the public interest his moving principle; and if chosen to purify the public Departments, he will not shrink from the duty imposed by the people.

Mr. Clay has said that he cannot "consent, in this early stage of their existence, by contributing to the election of a Military Chieftain, to give the strongest guaranty that this republic will march in the

fatal road which has conducted every other republic to ruin."

What is the road that has led all other republics to ruin? It is the road of corruption. Mr. Adams, in his book upon the Fisheries, referring to a speech of the Hon. John Floyd, of Virginia, said:

"There had been a time, when, upon a critical occasion, in which my public conduct was not a little involved, Mr. Floyd, still more unknown to me than at present, had, in the House of Representatives, taken a part which had given him claims to my esteem—perhaps to my gratitude.

"His conduct and opinions then were doubtless actuated exclusively by public motives, and without reference at all to me. Yet I was grateful to him for his support of a cause which it had been my duty to defend: The cause of a Hero, upon whose public services was invoked the public censure of his country."

Mr. Adams identified his reference by appending a note, as follows:

"See the debate in the House of Representatives, on the Seminolean War. February, 1819. Mr. Floyd's Speech."

By referring to this speech, we find that Gen. Floyd defended the conduct of Gen. Jackson, which is now relied on by the partisans of Mr. Adams, as the strongest grounds of objection to him; and we cannot impress upon your minds with too much force, the sentiment so forcibly adopted by Mr. Adams, and so eloquently expressed by the patriotic speaker, Mr. Floyd.

It will be recollected that Mr. Adams had defended the conduct of Gen. Jackson, and that the public understood the attack which Mr. Clay and his partisans in Congress, at that time made upon the General, to be an attack upon Mr. Monroe's Administration, for the purpose of injuring Mr. Adams. In reply to Mr. Clay, Gen. Floyd said:

"The Hon. Speaker [Mr. Clay] says too, should we not cling to the Constitution, and preserve it, by passing these resolutions, the day is close at hand when some daring Chieftain, after another splendid victory, will strut in his gaudy costume, casting a look of approbation as he walks between obedient rows of admiring vassals, and seize upon our liberties, and the hills around your Capitol will be covered with the gorgeous palaces of a pampered noblesse; and then tells us, in words which sound very like Patrick Henry's, that Rome had her Cæsar, Britain her Cromwell, France her Napoleon, and may we profit by the example. I saw, or thought I saw, the impression those dangers of military men seemed to make upon the House, and I believe I am about to hazard an opinion, new in a degree, and very opposite to that of both of these honorable gentlemen, [Mr. Hopkinson, of Pennsylvania, and Mr Clay,] which is, that no Government has ever yet been destroyed by a successful military chieftain. I appeal to history to support me."

[Here Mr. Floyd stated some historical facts, and proceeded.]

"No, Mr. Chairman, our liberties are not to be endangered by a successful Military Chieftain, returning to us with his gaudy costume, even after an hundred victories of New Orleans. It is here, in this Capitol, on this floor, that our liberty is to be sacrificed,—and that by the hollow, treacherous eloquence of some ambitious, proud, aspiring demagogue. And if, in times to come, we should hear of a favorite officer, who has exhausted his constitution in defence of his country, throwing wreaths of victory at her feet, charged with violations of her liberty, let us inquire whether the sternness of his virtues is not his greatest blemish."

Such was the language of Mr. Floyd, adopted by Mr. Adams. Such was the language of history, speaking in the voice of prophecy. And we call on you, fellow citizens, as you love your liberties, to rally to the polls, and by voting for the candidate of the people, avoid the impending evil.

Already have we seen the "hollow, treacherous eloquence of a proud aspiring demagogue" defeat your will, and impose upon you a President of *his* choice. Confirm *his* power, and submit to *his* dictation, and you are slaves. But rise in the majesty of your strength, and elect for yourselves a President, and you are free.

JOHN P. VAN NESS, *Chair'n.*
HENRY C. NEALE, *Secretary.*

Since the above was in type, the following has been handed to us through the Frankfort Argus, in confirmation of Mr. M'Millan's testimony.

"We whose names are undersigned, do hereby certify, that sometime subsequent to the last Presidential election, we heard Francis Johnson, Esq. in the town of Tompkinsville, Monroe county, give as a reason for voting for John Quincy Adams, that, *if Mr. Adams was elected President, Mr. Clay would be Secretary of State;* but that, *if General Jackson was elected President, Mr. Clay would not be Secretary;* and that he believed, Mr. Adams for President, with Mr. Clay for Secretary, would conduce more to the interest of the West, than General Jackson for President, with we know not whom for Secretary. We do not pretend to give Mr. Johnson's precise words; but we say positively, that the above is true in substance, and we know we are not mistaken.

WILLIAM HOWARD,
ISAAC JACKSON,
JOSHUA RUSH,
BENJAMIN RUSH,
HOWARD MERCER,
LEWIS FRANKLIN.

APPENDIX.

In submitting the mass of testimony collected into this Appendix, the Committee deem it proper to say, that the principal object of their Reply has been to establish the understanding upon which Mr. Clay voted for Mr. Adams. Upon this point, they are of opinion, the evidence is conclusive. They have not followed Mr. Clay through his insinuations against Gen. Jackson. They have carefully abstained from any disputation which may lead to a false issue. The question is, Did Mr. Clay vote for Mr. Adams under an understanding that he was to be appointed Secretary of State? The reader will, however, find in the Appendix the evidence of disinterested and respectable witnesses, disproving almost every assertion and insinuation which Mr. Clay has attempted to make against Gen. Jackson. Thus, the statement of Mr. Eaton of the Senate, relating to the authorship of Mr. Kremer's letter; the letters of Messrs. Eaton and White of the Senate, and those of Messrs. Blair and Isacks of the House of Representatives, relative to the statement of Mr. Clay, that the Tennessee delegation in Congress had given a dinner for the purpose of procuring a reconciliation between Mr. Clay and Gen. Jackson, which Mr. C. insinuates was sought with a view to obtain his vote for the latter, prove that Mr. Clay's charges are without a shadow of truth. The Committee have preferred to publish the testimony, and leave the public to draw their own inference, rather than enter into an argument upon immaterial points, for Mr. Clay's tact consists in his ability to make up *false* issues. Let the people read, compare, and judge for themselves.

No. 1.

From the Western Argus.

The Investigation in the Kentucky Legislature.

THURSDAY, Jan. 31, 1828.

The Senate took up the resolutions on the subject of Internal Improvements, together with the amendment offered by Mr. Beatty, declaring the distinguished members of Congress from this State who had voted for Mr. Adams, innocent of bargain, &c. and that all the charges to that effect, made against them, were false and malicious. After some desultory discussion, which we did not hear, Mr. *Maupin* called for the previous question, which, it was supposed, would have the effect of ridding the Senate of the whole subject except the original resolutions relative to Internal Improvements. This motion was seconded by Mr. M'Connell.

Mr. *Beatty* opposed the previous question, which was advocated by Mr. *M'Connell*.

Mr. *Dawiess* moved a recess for an hour and a half, that the members might consult together, and come to some understanding, &c. which motion prevailed.

After the recess, Mr. *Wickliffe* opposed the previous question, and maintained that the proposition for an investigation was an independent one, not embraced by it, and that its success would not rid the Senate of the inquiry. He also contended that the hearing of testimony was the order of the day, and not the consideration of these resolutions.

Mr. *Pope* concurred in the suggestion that the Senate were wrong in taking up the resolutions, and that the proper business of the day was the hearing of evidence.

Mr. *Maupin* withdrew the call for the previous question.

Mr. *Pope* then moved that all the resolutions before the Senate embracing the subject of the proposed investigation, be laid on the table until the last day of July next, and said he would then concur in striking from the Journals the resolution providing for an investigation.

Mr. *M'Connell* stated that he was now for going into it.

Mr. *Wickliffe* moved to lay down the resolutions for the purpose of going into the investigation. This motion prevailed.

The resolution ordering an investigation was then taken up, and the following evidence offered.

James M'Millan, of the House of Representatives, stated in reply to interrogatories, that Mr. Francis Johnson was at Tompkinsville, in Monroe county, after his return home, subsequently to the Presidential election, where he was asked how he came to vote for Mr. Adams? Mr. Johnson answered, that he voted for Mr. Adams to get Mr. Clay made Secretary of State. He made this declaration repeatedly in conversation, and witness believed in a public speech. He said, that Mr. Adams for President, and Mr. Clay his Secretary, would conduce more to the interests of the west, than General Jackson President, with we know not whom for his Secretary, and that Mr. Clay might perhaps succeed him. He did not hear Mr. Johnson say that Mr. Adams made any promises to appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State, if he would support him. Previous to his going on to Congress, Mr. Johnson spoke against Mr. Adams, and in favor of Mr. Clay; but witness never heard him say for whom he intended to vote, if Mr. Clay was excluded from Congress, nor did he, previous to that time, ever hear him say a word against General Jackson. Witness was a Jackson man.

Henry Grider, of the House of Representatives, said, Mr. F Johnson in all conversations and speeches in his presence, had denied all corruption, bargain and sale in the Presidential election, and said he neither knew nor believed any such thing. He had disclaimed all knowledge that he would appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State, or who was to compose his cabinet. He said he supported Mr. Adams, because he believed him devoted to Internal Improvements and Domestic Manufactures, and that his doctrines and policy were such as would suit the west. He said that General Jackson would not suit us, because he was a southern man, and would pursue a southern policy. Mr. Johnson said these things after he was charged with bargain, sale and corruption; but witness supposed the papers containing those charges got to Kentucky as soon as Mr. Johnson did after the election. He lives in the same town with Mr. Johnson, and has conversed with him frequently from the time he came home, and he has uniformly made the same declaration. Witness never heard him say he preferred Gen. Jackson. Witness said he was an administration man, or a friend of Internal Improvements and Domestic Manufactures.

Witness said he knew not why he was called, unless it was from a remark he made in Frank-

tort, that they need not send to Bowling Green for testimony, for he knew as much about it as any body there: meaning that there was nobody there who knew any thing about it. It was in the presence of Mr. B Johnson and Mr. Kendall. [The latter remembers the remark, but did not procure him to be summoned]

William Tanner was called and sworn. A pamphlet was shown to him, entitled "Letters to John Quincy Adams, relative to the Fisheries and the Mississippi, first published in the Argus of Western America, revised and enlarged, by Amos Kendall," and he was asked whether he printed it. He replied that he did. He was asked whether Mr. Clay paid any part of the expense. He replied that he did pay $100; that he, Tanner, undertook to print the pamphlet by subscription; that Mr. Kendall told him Mr. Clay had proposed to him to print it, and offered to pay a part of the expense; that he had taken a letter from Mr. Kendall to Mr. Clay; that Mr. Clay conversed with him as to the expense of printing the pamphlet, and the subscription for it: that he told him to go to Mr. Thomas Smith, who would hand him $75, and that if he should not be remunerated by the subscriptions, to call on him and he would pay him the balance of the expense; that he called on Mr. Smith, who paid him the money; that the subscriptions falling short, he again called on Mr. Clay, who sent him to Mr. Smith for $25 more. The pamphlet was printed in the latter part of 1823.

Amos Kendall stated, in reply to interrogatories, that after the charges against Mr. Adams relative to the negotiation at Ghent had come before the public, he wrote and published an article in the Argus upon that subject, containing a view of it which Mr. Clay deemed erroneous. Mr. Adams seized upon the article, copied it into his book on the Fisheries and the Mississippi, and made a commentary upon it, in which he insinuated that it came from Mr. Clay. The latter afterwards called upon witness, entered into a narrative of the transactions at Ghent, including an explanation of the principles involved, and satisfied witness that the view he had taken was erroneous. Witness then took up Mr. Adams' book upon the Fisheries, &c. and reviewed it in a series of Letters published in the Argus, addressed to John Quincy Adams. After most of the series had been published, Mr. Clay conversed with witness about publishing them in pamphlet, and offered to pay $50 of the expense. Witness declined publishing them; but told him, that if he or his friends thought proper to publish them elsewhere, he would revise and prepare them for the press. Learning from Mr. Tanner that he had determined to print them, witness gave him a letter to Mr. Clay, soliciting him to pay Mr. Tanner what he had promised to witness. Witness did revise the letters, and they were published by Mr. Tanner.

Mr. *Pope* told witness to stand aside, and that he would again be called to another point, and witness retired to his seat.

It was insisted that the examination of the witness should be completed, before he was permitted to retire. Some remarks were made which seemed to reflect on witness as not having told all he was bound to tell, when he observed that he was ready to answer questions if there were any to be asked. Mr. John Green inquired whether he had told all he knew about bargain, sale and corruption, and if so he had nothing further to ask. The witness returned no answer, and sat down.

Mr. *Pope* again called the witness, and asked him what he had heard Mr. David White say as to his motives for voting for Mr. Adams?

Mr. *Hardin* objected to this question being answered. A discussion arose in which Messrs. Hardin, M'Connell and Wickliffe contended that the question ought not to be answered, and Messrs. Pope, Daviess, and Allen, maintained that it ought. The former insisted that Mr. White himself was a competent witness, and that he ought to be sent for; that his character was not under investigation; and that if he knew any thing in relation to a bargain between Adams and Clay, he ought to be brought in to state it himself, as he is not more than twelve miles off, instead of proving his declarations when not on oath; that they were willing the declarations of those members of Congress who were not here, and could not be got here, should be proved. On the other side it was maintained that the conduct of Mr. White was brought under investigation as much as that of any other member of Congress from Kentucky who voted for Mr. Adams; that his declarations were good evidence against himself, and to that point only were they offered to be proved; that he could not, consistently with any rule of law or propriety, be introduced to purge himself upon oath; that the principles assumed here would exclude the declarations of every member of Congress who voted for Mr. Adams, and put an end to the inquiry; that it could be considered as urged only for the purpose of excluding evidence which gentlemen knew would prove the truth of the charges made by the friends of Jackson, and Mr. Pope, in emphatic terms, told the Senate, that he viewed it as an effort of the majority to exclude the truth in an investigation which themselves had sought and urged, and so he would tell the people.

The vote was taken upon the question, 'Shall the question be answered?" and decided in the negative. The Senate then adjourned.

FRIDAY, February 1.

Sickness prevented our attending the Senate on this day, and consequently we can only give the evidence as we have written it out from the notes of others.

Thomas D. Carneal, a Senator, at the request of Mr. Pope, stated, that he had a conversation with Mr. Clay at his room, a few days before he started for Washington City, in the fall of 1824. Mr. Clay said he did not like to be instructed by the Legislature as to his vote, should he not be returned to the House as one of the three highest, which he thought doubtful, but wished to be left entirely free. Mr. Carneal told him he had intended to introduce resolutions of instruction into the Senate himself, requesting the Kentucky delegation to vote for Gen. Jackson, but promised, on account of the objections of Mr. Clay, not to do it, although he said he must vote for them should they be introduced by others. Mr. Clay said, in case he were excluded from the House, he was wholly uncommitted as to his vote, and wished to be left free. This conversation took

place while the Legislature was in session, in the fall of 1824.

Oliver Keene stated that in the fall of 1824, eight or ten days before Mr. Clay started for Washington City, he asked Mr. Clay, in conversation, whether he had written to General Jackson to come to his house and go on to Washington with him? Mr. Clay said he had. Witness was a warm supporter of Mr. Clay, but prefers Jackson to Adams.

Francis McAlear stated, that on the morning Mr. Clay started for Washington, in the fall of 1824, in the presence of several gentlemen, he heard Mr. Clay say he had written to General Jackson to come through Lexington and go on to Washington with him, but had received no answer, and had given him out. Witness was a warm advocate of Mr. Clay, until he voted for John Quincy Adams.

John T. Johnson stated, that he was at Washington City in 1824, and at the time of the Presidential election in February, 1825. After the election, he and his brother (Colonel Johnson) were in company with General Metcalfe, who told them he had a letter from Kentucky which stated that the people would be dissatisfied with the result. His brother told the General that this voting for Mr. Adams would be an up-hill business in Kentucky. The General replied, *I fear we have done too much for our friend.*

He knew of no direct bargain, nor of any corruption, nor had he ever believed there was any. He had very little intercourse with the members of Congress who voted for Mr. Adams, it being well known that he intended to vote for General Jackson.

He was asked to state whether he did not hear Mr. White, one of the members of Congress who voted for Mr. Adams, say, a few days after the election, that he considered when voting for Mr. Adams that he was voting for Mr. Clay?

This question was objected to; and overruled, 14 to 19.

Witness was further asked whether he did not hear Mr. White say, either on his way to Congress or at any time before the Presidential election, that he would vote for General Jackson, in preference to Adams or Crawford?

This was also overruled, 14 to 19.

Witness was further asked, did or did you not hear Mr. White say, that if Mr. Adams were elected, Mr. Clay would be made Secretary of State?

This was also overruled, 13 to 19.

Mr. Clay was in his room a few days before the election, and said, he thought the Kentucky delegation might vote either way, and Kentucky would be satisfied.

In December, at a public dinner, he saw Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay sitting together, and observed that they were very social and friendly. From this circumstance, he said to his brother, that he was persuaded Mr. Clay intended to vote for Mr. Adams. Mr. Clay told witness he had been instructed by a few of his constituents, in a part of his district above Lexington, to do as he pleased. After Mr. Clay was appointed Secretary of State, he asked witness whether he ought to accept, and witness told him he thought he ought.

Joseph Secrest, a member of the House of Representatives, stated that he heard Mr. David Trimble say, in a speech or speeches, made in 1824, that John Q. Adams was a noted federalist; that he was inimical to the west, and wanted to sell to the British the navigation of the Mississippi. After his return from Congress in 1825, he heard Mr. Trimble give, as an apology for voting for Mr. Adams, that if Mr. Adams had not been elected, Mr. Clay would not have been Secretary of State, and that if General Jackson had been elected, Mr. Adams would have been Secretary. Witness did not like his apology, and did not wait to hear all he said about it. Trimble since explained to him, alleging that he said Mr. Adams was a *reputed* federalist, and not a noted federalist. General Jackson is not witness's first choice for President, by several; but Adams is his last.

SATURDAY, February 2.

Amos Kendall being again called, was asked whether he was not informed, three or four weeks before the Presidential election, that Mr. Clay would be Secretary of State, if Mr. Adams were made President?

Mr. *Hardin* objected to the question being answered, unless it were first stated from whom the information came.

Witness said he was embarrassed, because to state from whom the information came, was to say he had the information; and on the supposition he had not the information, it could have come from nobody.

He was told to answer; and accordingly answered, that he had such information from Francis P. Blair, Esq. of Frankfort.

Mr. *John Green* asked if it was the same F. P. Blair, who was Clerk of the New Court?

Witness answered that it was the same who, in the days of the New Court, was the Clerk of the Court of Appeals.

Mr. *Duviess* asked whether Mr. Blair had not been for many years the intimate and confidential friend of Mr. Clay?

This question, as well as the question and answer first above given, were objected to, and voted to be improper and inadmissible, by a vote of 10 to 20.

Witness said he felt bound to state a circumstance which he could not help believing had some bearing upon the subject of this inquiry, upon which the Senate might draw their own inferences.

After Mr. Clay was excluded from the House, and previous to the Presidential election, he received a letter from Mr. Clay, communicating his intention to offer witness some situation at Washington, contingent, as he understood it, upon the result of the Presidential election. The expressions of the letter, so far as he could recollect, were, that he, Mr. Clay, had hoped to have it in his power to offer him, witness, a situation at Washington more agreeable to him than the one he occupied in Frankfort, but that there was then some doubt as to the result of affairs there. Witness thinks it was written and received in January, 1825. The letter contained no other subject, and witness, not perceiving any other object in it, took it merely as an indication of Mr. Clay's friendly designs in relation to himself.

After the Presidential election, and after Mr. Clay was made Secretary of State, witness received another letter from him, stating that he intended to offer him a situation at Washington

City, but it was wholly indefinite as to the nature of the situation intended to be offered. Witness imagined Mr. Clay wanted him to write in support of Mr. Adams and himself; and to ascertain whether he was authorized, from the letter and circumstances, to take up such an impression, he showed this letter to two of Mr. Clay's and his own friends, separately, and asked each of them to read it, and say what situation Mr. Clay intended. They read it, and each gave his opinion that Mr. Clay desired to place witness in a situation to write in support of Mr. Adams and himself. Witness then wrote to him, communicating the impression he had taken up, stating that he had been for some years writing against Mr. Adams, and wished it to be understood, before any offer was made, that he could accept no situation in which it would be expected of him to take up his pen in support of Mr. Adams; but that in relation to him, Mr. Clay, the feelings of witness were wholly different, and it would give him pleasure to vindicate him against the slanders which were afloat against him; for he then believed much that was said against him, to be slanders.

Witness heard nothing more from Mr. Clay, in relation to this subject, until he came out to Kentucky, he thinks, in the following June. Calling upon Mr. Clay, at his room at Weisger's, one of the first remarks made to him by that gentleman was, that witness had totally misconceived his object; that he did not wish him to go to Washington for the purpose of engaging in politics, but to secure his services in the Department of State. He then offered witness a Clerkship, with a salary of $1000, with the express injunction that he should say nothing on the subject, and not leave Kentucky until after the elections in the succeeding August. After a little conversation upon the expense of living at Washington, witness declined Mr. Clay's offer, stating that he had several children, for whose support and education he must provide, and could not accept a place which would afford him but a bare subsistence. Mr. Clay said, there was none more valuable then within his gift, unless he were to make a vacancy; but that probably an opportunity might offer to give witness a place which would be acceptable to him. Witness told him then, and informed him at other times, that he would accept such a place, always with the understanding that he should take no part in the politics of the day.

Some time after this, witness met Squire Turner, of Madison county, in the streets of Frankfort, who accosted him and said, I understand you are going to Washington City to write for Adams and Clay. Witness asked him where he got his information? Mr. Turner said such was the talk up in his section of the country. Witness told him it was not true. A few days after, he understood that George Robertson had said, at the Mercer Court, that they, the Old Court party, would not have witness to contend with much longer, saying or implying that he was bought up to go to Washington City.—Knowing that an information of Mr Clay's offer had gone from him, on which this rumor could be predicated, witness supposed it must have come from Mr. Clay. He therefore wrote to Mr. Clay, informing him of the rumor then in circulation, and stating that he presumed it must have come from some person to whom he had communicated his intentions towards witness, and, under those circumstances, witness must feel himself at liberty to detail the whole transaction whenever he thought proper, which he had done. Mr. Clay answered, that he was totally indifferent to what was said on the subject, as his motives in relation to him had been pure, and he had only wanted to engage his services in the Department of State.

After the elections in 1825, when the party to which witness belonged, were so effectually defeated, he informed Mr. Clay of the result, and that gentleman, in his reply, again offered him the same Clerkship. Witness declined accepting it, and informed Mr. Clay that so much injustice had been done him in that year's canvass, that he was determined to have another campaign with the Old Court Party, and that no office he could offer, would take him from Kentucky until that was over.

Mr. Clay never made any other specific offer, although he still expressed a disposition to befriend witness in that way.

Mr. *Hardin* asked if witness had the letters alluded to?

Witness said he had burnt them all, except the last.

Mr H. asked, if he was in the habit of burning letters?

He said he was, such as he did not wish to fall into the hands of friends or foes.

Mr. H. said, you burn letters and then tell their contents?

Witness said, he had been reminded of his duty by the gentleman from Lincoln; that he should not have mentioned this affair, if he had not now believed the first letter had some connexion with the application made to him by Mr. Blair, before the Presidential election, in relation to which the Senate might draw their own inferences.

Mr. H. asked, whether witness had not toasted Mr. Clay since the Presidential election.

Witnessed answered, it was very likely, although he did not recollect it; for his feelings were friendly towards Mr. Clay for some time after that event.

Mr. H. asked, whether witness had not applied to Mr. Clay, before his first letter, to get him an office?

Witness answered, never, although he had afterwards frequently expressed his readiness to accept one, if it were such as he could accept.

Mr. H. asked, if Mr. Clay's taking the printing of the acts of Congress from witness had not made him hostile to him.

Witness said, it was impossible for him to tell how far his feelings had been influenced by that act.

Mr. H. asked, if it had made witness more friendly to Mr. Clay?

Witness presumed not, although he was very glad Mr. Clay had done it.

Mr. Pope asked, what made witness glad that Mr. Clay took the printing from him?

Witness replied, that he came to Kentucky early in the year 1814, while Mr. Clay was in Europe; that it so happened, that Mrs. Clay employed him to live in her family for one year, and teach her children; that he remained there about a year, and then settled in George-

town; that shortly afterwards, he went to Lexington on business, and was taken sick in a boarding house; that Mrs. Clay, hearing of it, sent her carriage for him, and as soon as he could be removed, had him carried to her house, where she nursed him with the utmost kindness, until he was able to return to Georgetown; that Mr. Clay had not yet come home, and witness had never seen him; that this kindness of Mrs. Clay laid him under a weight of obligation to her, which he always felt and acknowledged; that when Mr. Clay came home, he received a very cordial letter from him, thanking him for his service in his family, &c.; that an acquaintance was formed shortly after, which was kept up with the most friendly feelings until since the late presidential election; that he had been stimulated in his exertions to promote Mr. Clay's views by his obligations to Mrs. Clay; that to Mr. Clay himself, he owes no obligations, and never did; that he had labored greatly and spent much of his time and some of his money in efforts to advance Mr. Clay, without asking for recompense or remuneration, until the advances made by Mr. Clay himself; that in taking the printing from witness, Mr. Clay on his part exhibited a personal hostility towards him, which relieved him from the restraint his feelings were under, and left him to take that course which he thought duty pointed out, perfectly unrestrained.

F. P. Blair was then called. He refused to be sworn, and offered the following protest in writing:

"I object to be sworn to give evidence in this inquiry. I hold that the 5th resolution of the Senate, declaring certain charges *"to be utterly false and malicious, and made throughout the United States to blast the reputations of the distinguished members of Congress from this State, who voted for John Quincy Adams,"* upon which this investigation is founded, does not furnish a subject constitutionally cognizable by this Senate, either as a branch of the Legislature or as a judicial tribunal. But while I deny the *right*, I submit to the *power* of the Senate, and will abide its ultimate decision.

"I also object, because the information I have, touching this inquiry, was obtained in the course of friendly communications and a private correspondence, which I deem confidential—such at least as was never designed for publication.

"I assure the Senate, that I am not actuated to withhold my testimony by any consideration of the effect it might have on the reputations of the persons alluded to in the resolution, or on those inculpated as having made false charges against them. I oppose myself to a precedent which goes to violate confidential correspondence, and to render unsafe all friendly, social, and intimate intercourse among men. This obstacle it is not in the power of the Senate to remove, and I trust it will not exert its power to punish that good faith which would preserve a principle that should be held inviolable, unless where *the laws of the country demanded the sacrifice.*"

Some conversation took place among the members, when *Mr. Hardin* offered to the Senate, a paper declaring that the Senate would hear whatever evidence might be offered, but would use no compulsory means to extort it.

Mr. Dawiess called on the majority to take the necessary steps to bring out the evidence. The friends of Mr. Adams have the majority in the Senate; they enter into an investigation to ascertain the truth; the minority offer a witness to prove a most important fact, he refuses to swear, and the majority pat him on the back and say, yes, my good fellow, keep it back, and we will protect you in it. Is this the way gentlemen intend to arrive at the truth, and procure the means of forming a correct opinion? Is it by encouraging the witnesses not to swear, and refusing to compel them, when they know, from the very objections offered, that the testimony is of the utmost importance? It was turning the whole subject into mockery, and would make the Senate the laughing stock of the world. The majority have refused to let the declarations of one of the members of Congress who voted for Mr. Adams be proved, and they now say to this witness, for God's sake, keep back what you know. Does not this look as if they were afraid of the truth? He called on the majority, and especially the gentleman from Fayette, who had yesterday said, if they brought a witness there who refused to swear, he would take the means to compel him, now to adopt the measures which are necessary to bring the truth out of the witness.

Mr. John Green observed, that he had expected a blow out when he saw Mr. Blair introduced. He remembered a time when a body, called by the gentleman from Fayette, the Pungus court, sat in this very house, and by their officers broke open the house of poor old Sneed and seized his papers, and perhaps took him into custody. The witness, he believed, was Clerk of that Court; but he was glad to see him now on the side of the constitution. He did not enter into this thing for the purpose of hearing any other than *willing* witnesses. It was to give an opportunity for those who had been trumpeting to the world the charges of bargain, sale, and corruption, to come in and show on what ground those charges had been founded. He was glad there was some faith left in the world, and maintained that the Senate had no right to extort from the witness communications made to him in confidence. For himself, he had no conversation with Mr. Blair; but he presumed he must have spoken of letters from Mr. Clay, or made communications of some kind to some body, or he would not have been called here as a witness, and surely he might disclose to the Senate whatever he had said relative to his confidential correspondence to any other person, &c.

Mr. Blair begged leave to explain. He said, in substance, in reply to Mr. Green's remarks, that Mr. Kendall's letters to Mr. Clay had pointed out him to the public as one who knew something in relation to the subject now before the Senate. These letters referred to a conversation which he had with Mr. Kendall in January, 1825, in which he stated that Mr. Clay would be Secretary, if Mr. Adams were made President. Mr. Kendall supposed that the information was received in letters from Mr. Clay to Mr. Crittenden or myself, and as Mr. Crittenden had declared he received no such letters, it had pointed inquiry directly to

him. Mr. Blair said, that Mr. Kendall had made his publications without consultation or authority from him, and that his inferences were not founded on any information, or warranted by any communication he had made to him, other than that before mentioned. He had not communicated to any one the grounds on which he had made his statement to Mr. Kendall, nor had he shown the letters to which the gentleman alluded, to any person to whom they were not addressed.

A few remarks were made by other members; but extreme ill health compelled us to leave the Senate before the matter was decided, and not being in an attitude to take notes, we may not have reported what passed while we were there, with entire accuracy.

The question was finally put—shall Mr. Blair be sworn? and decided in the affirmative.

Mr. Blair then refused to be sworn peremptorily, and said he would sooner go to jail.

Finally, on motion of Mr. Pope, he was discharged.

Micajah Harrison was then called, and he also refused to be sworn, on the ground that what he knew was communicated in confidence.

It was moved to commit him until he would submit to give evidence before the Senate, which was decided in the negative, only six voting for it. He was then discharged.

John Mason, jr. was then called, and stated as follows:

John Mason, of Montgomery, states, that before David Trimble went to Congress in 1824, say September Court, 1824, he was contending with witness, that Mr. Rowan ought not to be elected Senator to Congress, because he was an apostate federalist, and that he would be surprised if witness voted for him. Witness said, that the Presidential election was coming on, and from the number of candidates he expected that the election would come before Congress, and said to Trimble, suppose that you vote for Mr. Adams, who is also an apostate federalist. Trimble replied, he knew Adams to be an apostate federalist, and that if he ever voted for him, witness might call him a federalist as long as he lived. He also said, that Adams had agreed to give up the navigation of the Mississippi river, for whales and mackerel, and that he, Adams, had always been an enemy to the West. When witness heard that Trimble had voted for Adams, he was surprised; and soon after his return, he had a conversation with him about his vote, in which he gave as his reasons, that we ascertained if Mr. Adams was made President, Mr. Clay would be made Secretary of State, and that if General Jackson was made President, Mr. Clay would not be made Secretary, and that it would be better for us to have Adams with Mr. Clay, Secretary, than General Jackson, without him. He also said at that time, or in some conversation after, that General Jackson was opposed to the tariff on hemp, bagging, &c. and therefore opposed to the Kentucky interest; and he also gave as a reason, that General Jackson had disgraced the Kentuckians at New Orleans in his report. He thinks he heard Major Trimble express some of the same opinions in his public speeches. Witness is a Jackson man, and as warm on any side he espouses as he thinks is right and justifiable; that he has had divers conversations and arguments with Maj. Trimble, and what he said as to the tariff and the other objections, except the one in which he said that they had ascertained or discovered that if Adams were elected Clay would be made Secretary, and if General Jackson were elected, that he would not be Secretary, were made in those after conversations.

MONDAY, February 4.

Some discussion took place upon a motion to take up the resolution from the Committee on Internal Improvements, with the amendments offered by Mr. *Beatty* in favor of the Administration, which was objected to on the ground that further evidence was expected in relation to the subject of the fifth resolution. The resolutions were, however, taken up; but the hour of twelve o'clock having arrived, the Speaker called for the orders of the day. A motion was made to dispense with the orders, for the purpose of going on with the resolutions; but it was negatived, although a majority voted for it, the rule of the Senate requiring two-thirds to dispense with the orders.

TUESDAY, February 5.

Mr. *Wickliffe* offered a resolution rescinding the rule of the Senate requiring two-thirds to concur in dispensing with the orders of the day. This motion was opposed by Messrs. *Daviess*, *Pope*, and *Dudley*, on the ground that it was intended to operate on the special case before the Senate, and that all such legislation is improper.

The hour of 12 o'clock having arrived, the Speaker called up the orders of the day. The resolutions in relation to Internal Improvements, and the Administration, were first in the orders, and were consequently taken up.

Mr. *Daviess* moved to admit and examine certain witnesses now in attendance. Some discussion took place on this subject, in which it was insisted, that the inquiry ought to be brought to an end, because the session is approaching to its close, and it is proper that the Legislature should express its opinion upon the subjects involved, before its adjournment. It was generally acceded, that the examination of witnesses should close on this day, unless testimony should be introduced on the Administration side, when rebutting evidence might be introduced.

John S. Hitt, of Bourbon, stated, that in 1825, on the 4th or 5th of January, he went into Washington City in the evening, and was in company with Gen. Metcalfe, and asked him for information relative to the Presidential election? He said he knew little more than when he first arrived, or than witness; that the friends of Jackson would come to us and say, we hear you are going to vote for Mr. Adams; and the friends of Adams would come to us and say, we understand you are going to vote for Jackson; and so of the friends of Crawford; that we stand uncommitted, and we must know something about how the cabinet is to be filled. He left the City on the 8th in the evening, and had not ascertained before he left there, how the Kentucky delegation would vote. While at the

city, Mr. Johnson said, in his presence, he had received a parcel of letters from home; he was asked what was the news? He replied, they say, stick to Old Hickory—give us a Western President, whatever you do.

Dr. A. W. Bills, of Bourbon county, stated, that at Shumate's Tavern, in Millersburg, in the spring of 1825, in company with several persons, Gen. Metcalfe, upon being asked by witness, denied and disclaimed that there was any bargain, sale, or corruption, in the Presidential election, but did not doubt that there was a great deal of logrolling amongst the friends of all the candidates. Propositions, he said, might have been made in a jocular manner by the friends of the respective candidates for the Presidency, but that he knew nothing which was seriously intended. Witness then related the substance of the testimony of Mr. Hitt, as what had taken place between some person and a member of Congress from Kentucky. This seemed to attract the attention of the General very much, and he pressed witness to know which of the members had been said to have made such remarks, stating, that he felt solicitous to know to whom the allusion was, as he was unwilling to divide the responsibility. If attributed to him, he did not wish others to share it with him; if not, he wished to stand clear of the imputation. Through motives of delicacy, witness declined any definite explanation on account of the company present, with the intention, at a future time, to explain his allusions. Witness was, before the last Presidential election, and still is, in favor of Gen. Jackson for the Presidency.

Joseph Miller was present at the conversation stated by Dr. Bills, and confirmed his statement.

JOHN DESHA'S STATEMENT.

A statement of the conversation which took place between Gen. Metcalfe and John Desha, in the spring of 1825, in Carlisle, shortly after the General returned from Congress.

After the common salutation took place, I said: Well, General, you have made us a President?

He answered, yes.

Do you think the people of Kentucky will be pleased with your vote?

I think they will, when they hear my reasons.

What are your reasons, Sir?

Why, we could not possibly get Mr. Clay in the cabinet without voting for and electing Mr. Adams, and we could not do without Mr. Clay's talents.

I told him I thought very highly of Mr. Clay, but I supposed there were a good many equally qualified in the United States, and we could do without him if he were dead. But, General, did not General Jackson go into Congress with fifteen more votes than any other candidate?

Yes.

And besides, did not the Kentucky Legislature inform you that a majority of the people of the State wished you, if they could not get Mr. Clay elected, to certainly vote for Gen. Jackson?

He answered, he thought he knew as well as the Legislature, as he left Kentucky some days after the Legislature had convened.

But, General, you could not know as well as they, as they were immediately from every county in the State.

Let it be as it may, I did as I pleased; and I have another reason.

What is that, General?

We might have been all the time engaged, and have risen without making a President at all, without we elected Mr. Adams.

So much the better, I said, for then we would have Mr. Calhoun to administer the government, and I would much rather, and I believe the people of Kentucky would rather have him at the helm of government than Mr. Adams.

I refer you to Mr. John Miller, of Nicholas county, as he told me he (Metcalfe) gave him the very same reasons he gave me.

JOHN DESHA.

Nov. 17th, 1827.

Mr. BENNING:

Sir—I am, and have been a long time, in a bad state of health. I write this before my departure down to Natchez, as I think it may be good for my health to travel. You may publish this if you think proper.

I am, yours, &c.

JOHN DESHA.

STATEMENT.

I do certify, that some time previous to the last Presidential election; I heard David Trimble say, in a speech on the Court-house steps in Flemingsburg, that the elder John Adams was the most dangerous man in government in his day, and that young John Q. Adams was a chip of the old block; if any odds, worse; that in the treaty at Ghent, he wanted to barter away the navigation of the Mississippi, the key stone of the Western country, for a mess of codfish; that he was always considered an apostate federalist; that he always had been hostile to the West; and that we never will have an equal chance with the Eastern people, until we get a Western President; that we now have a chance in the West, for we have two candidates for the Presidency; and that he thought Henry Clay was the strongest; and if we could not get him, we have another chance in the West, to wit, Gen. Jackson.

I believe the above to be the sum and substance of his speech, if not the precise words.

Richard R. Lee,	*William Schockley,*
Turpley Taylor,	*Aquila Sampson,*
Charles Spencer,	*Jesse Summers,*
Mordecai Williams,	*Col. John Taylor,*
T. W. Jones,	*James Alexander.*
B. B. Early,	

September 21, 1827.

Mr. HARRISON'S STATEMENT.

After the most illiberal course pursued in the Senate by Mr. Hardin towards Mr. Harrison, we deemed it necessary to his own vindication before the world, that he should disclose what he knew. We accordingly addressed him a note, to which we received the following answer:

FRANKFORT, *7th Feb.* 1828.

A. KENDALL, Esq.

Dear Sir—Your letter of this date is received. You state, that it is due to myself, as well as

to my country, to say what I know upon the subject of the resolution which has been acted upon by the Senate, in regard to the late Presidential election

I had refused to give evidence before the Senate, under the presumption of the communication being made to me *freely* and in confidence. I observed, under this impression, the most scrupulous silence, during the last election, although opposed to the gentleman's election from whom I received it. Had a respectful politeness been observed towards me by an *honorable* Senator from Nelson, which a man deserving such an honor would have observed, I should not now disclose to you, and no doubt through you to the public, what I refused to disclose before the Senate. Without entering into *all* the minutiæ of conversation which took place, I will state that the Hon. David Trimble observed to me, "that *we*, (meaning I supposed the Kentucky delegation) had *distinctly* ascertained, that if Mr. Adams were elected President, Mr. Clay would be appointed his Secretary of State; and that, if General Jackson were elected President, Mr. Clay would not."

That in another conversation, not long previous to the last election, upon my observing to Mr. Trimble, that if Mr. Clay could have dismissed his prejudices against General Jackson, and had him elected instead of Mr. Adams, General Jackson would not have been a candidate for re-election, in my opinion, and Mr. Clay would have been his successor, Mr. Trimble replied, "you are mistaken; that, although Gen. Jackson might not wish to serve a second term, yet his friends would have impressed the necessity of his election, that the good of his country required it; for it is necessary that the President should be elected a second term to fill offices with his friends, or to place his friends in office."

The foregoing is substantially what I should have deposed to, had I been sworn before the Senate; and I regret that the *extremely* illiberal observations made use of by *honorable* members of the Senate, have imposed the painful task of saying any thing upon this subject which may go to the public.

I am, respectfully, your ob't servant,

M. HARRISON.

J. DUDLEY'S STATEMENT.

J. Dudley, Esq. a Senator from Franklin and Owen counties, being called upon, made the following statement on the floor of the Senate. One day in January, 1823, F. P. Blair came into the Senate Chamber, seated himself near me, and inquired my opinion on the resolutions passed requesting our members of Congress to vote for General Jackson as President of the United States. Mr. B. desired that I would write letters requesting the members, and particularly D. White, from this district, to consult with Mr. Clay and vote as he might desire. To this I objected, and gave my reasons therefor. Mr. B. appeared surprised that I should raise any objections, particularly as I was opposed to the resolutions. He said, that a number of members of both houses, who voted for the resolution, had written such letters, and that I could do it with more propriety. He said, if Mr. White could be induced to vote for Mr. Adams, he would obtain the vote of Kentucky, and with it the votes of most of the Western States, which would elect him; in which case Mr. Clay would obtain the appointment of Secretary of State. I then inquired how that fact had been ascertained? His answer was, that letters had been received from gentlemen of undoubted veracity, at Washington City, containing such information, and I might rely with confidence on that statement. I replied that, although I was opposed to the resolutions, I had no doubt they contained the truth, and therefore I could not say one word to induce our members of Congress to believe otherwise. I further protested against Mr. Clay's accepting any office under Mr. Adams, whom I considered a federalist of the Boston stamp in 1798 and 1800, and thenceforward an enemy of the west, and gave it as my opinion, that if they were united, they would sink together. I preferred that Mr. Clay should maintain the high attitude in which he then stood, by which means he would be the most prominent candidate at the next election.

Extract of a letter from *Jesse Summers, Esq.* to *General Allen*, giving his reasons for not attending at the bar of the Senate, dated Fleming county, Kentucky, February 5th, 1828:

I have heard Mr. David Trimble say, it was ascertained that if John Q. Adams was elected President, he would appoint Henry Clay Secretary of State; and he also stated, in all probability, if General Jackson was elected, he would not. At the same time, Mr. Trimble stated that the Representatives from this State, or a majority of them, thought that it would be better for us to have John Q. Adams President and Henry Clay Secretary of State, than to have General Jackson President and some other person Secretary. This may not be verbatim what Mr. Trimble said, but in substance it is correctly what I understood him to say, according to the best of my recollection.

Mr. Trimble had made it necessary for him to give some explanation for his vote on the Presidential election, on account of his having previously represented John Q. Adams to be a dangerous man, and an enemy to the western country. He said that Adams had voted, at the treaty of Ghent, to give up the navigation of the Mississippi to the British for a mess of codfish. Mr. Trimble having thus spoken of Mr. Adams, previous to his voting for him, is what made me somewhat astonished at him for voting for the man he had so denounced, and I felt very anxious to hear his apology, and when it came it was in part as above stated.

N. B. The above statements can be proved, if necessary, by many witnesses in this Congressional district.

Mr. Trimble stated, in his speech at Lewis court house, in October, 1825, that we, (the members of congress, as was understood,) ascertained that if General Jackson was made President he would not make our friend, Henry Clay, his Secretary of State; but that if Mr. Adams was made President, he would make Mr. Clay his Secretary; and then said, if the people expected him to vote for Gen. Jackson

under such circumstances, they expected from him what he could not and would not do. He said, that there was no other man in Kentucky who would do for a Secretary of State but Mr. Clay, and if Jackson were elected, Kentucky would have no voice in the cabinet.

HENRY HALBERT,
JESSE HAMBBICK.

Feb. 9th, 1828.

Sworn to before me, a Justice of the Peace for Franklin county, this 9th day of Feb. 1828.

H. WINGATE, J. P.

KENTUCKY LEGISLATURE.

FRIDAY, *December* 13, 1824.

The resolution requesting the members of the House of Representatives in Congress from this State, to vote for General Andrew Jackson as President of the United States, &c. were taken up. Mr. G. Robertson moved to lay the whole subject on the table, until the 1st of June next. His reasons were, that it would be unjust to our members in Congress, who knew the will of their constituents better than we do; that it would be indelicate to Mr. Clay; that it would lessen the weight of Kentucky in the next administration; that it was better to leave our members of Congress to act according to contingencies; that the weight and importance of the State and the western country, could, in that manner, be best secured; that our members on the spot would be the best judges of what was just and expedient, &c. Mr. B. Hardin avowed his preference to Mr. Crawford, so long as he had any chance, and his dislike to Mr. Adams, on account of his originally federal principles and his evident hostility to the growth of the West, as evinced by his votes in Congress on the acquisition of Louisiana, and his conduct elsewhere upon the navigation of the Mississippi, and the Missouri question He still entertained the highest respect for Mr. Crawford; but he had no doubt a majority of the people of Kentucky were in favor of Jackson, and he wished to express that preference decidedly. He considered the contest between Adams and Jackson, and he could have no hesitation in preferring the latter, both because he thought it was best for the general interest and the interest of the West. Mr. Crittenden offered a few remarks on the expediency of adopting the resolutions, because the people of Kentucky preferred General Jackson, and because it was not known to the people when our members of Congress left here, that Mr. Clay would be excluded from the House. Mr. Robertson made a few further remarks to prove the inexpediency of acting on the resolutions, and the propriety of leaving our members in Congress to act according to contingencies. Mr Shepherd had always been in favor of General Jackson; some of the friends of Mr. Clay, he had no doubt, wished to defeat the resolution, and leave that gentleman to make the best bargain he could. But he did not wish the vote of Kentucky to be bartered away, or that Mr. Clay should be Secretary of State to the exclusion of Jackson as President. Mr. Daviess had been in favor of Mr. Clay until he had failed, and his second choice was General Jackson. If it was thought by gentlemen that our members would vote for Adams, it was the more necessary that resolutions should pass—that public opinion in Kentucky may be known to them; and if it be supposed that they will vote for Jackson, they can do no harm. He was opposed to suffering any man to barter away the vote of Kentucky; and he believed that Mr. Clay himself, knowing the will of his State, would vote for Jackson in opposition to Adams, who in his section of country would not get one vote to fifty in opposition to General Jackson. As he had no doubt of the will of the people, he must vote for the resolutions. Mr. Breck should vote for laying the resolutions on the table, because he knew no reason for acting on them. He had voted for Mr. Clay, but he would not disguise the fact that he preferred any man who was, or had been a candidate, to General Jackson. We had elected members of Congress, and it was their business to know and perform the public will. In his county he believed that few would vote for Jackson against Crawford; but he did not know how it would be between Jackson and Adams. He thought if we acted at all, it ought to be by the members individually, in private meeting, and not in a legislative or official capacity. Mr. Chapeze would prefer Jackson to any man except Mr. Clay, and was indifferent between them; but he was opposed to the resolutions. The representatives in Congress are warm from the oven of public opinion, most of them having been re-elected within a few months, and it was their duty to fulfil the general will. The people had a right to instruct their members in Congress on this subject; but he denied that the Legislature have any such right. He also thought it an unjust imputation on Mr. Clay, to say he will, under any circumstances, barter away the vote of Kentucky. Mr. H. O. Brown, had a high respect for Mr. Clay; but a higher for his country. He considered this an important crisis; one in which the voice of Kentucky may make a President of the United States from the West. There could be no doubt that the contest was wholly between Adams and Jackson, and no man could say that the latter was not the choice of Kentucky. He believed our representatives would vote for Jackson; but he was for making assurance doubly sure. Mr. Rowan was decidedly in favor of the resolutions He had voted for Mr. Clay, but had he not been a citizen of the State, and a particular acquaintance, he should have preferred Jackson. In the present situation of affairs, he could have no hesitation He passed a high encomium on Mr. Adams, and a higher on General Jackson. In addition to other reasons, he preferred Jackson because he wished to break the chain of succession, and he wished there was a provision in the Constitution, prohibiting all heads of departments from being President. He gave his views at some length. Mr. Turner was in favor of neither Mr. Adams nor General Jackson. The former he viewed as a political apostate, who had changed sides to become popular, and such a character he detested: The other he considered a dangerous military chieftain, of a bad and tyrannical disposition. After a few further remarks from Messrs. Shepherd and Robertson, Mr. Wickliffe expressed his intention to vote for laying

the resolution on the table. He repelled all intimations that Mr. Clay or his friends would barter away the vote of Kentucky. On principle, he was opposed to the resolution, because it was an interference with other people's business. It was the duty of our representatives to know and do the people's will, without any instructions from us. The people could not be corrupted, but their legislators might be, and therefore, the State Legislatures ought not to interfere between the people and their representatives in Congress. He spoke highly of Mr. Crawford, but condemned Mr. Adams, because he was a political apostate, for which character he had no respect, and he was the last man he would choose. He spoke highly of Jackson; but was not in favor of the elevation of a military chieftain, and proceeded to point out the dangers of his course, although he said he had no apprehensions of General Jackson. Mr Dallam denied that the reason of instructions applied to this case. If it was admitted that the members of Congress know the will of the people, this course was unnecessary, and he believed they knew the public will, as well as we do. They were elected at the same time, and had equal chances for knowing it. His constituents never thought of his interference in this question when they elected him, and he was in favor of laying the whole on the table. Mr. Shortridge was in favor of the resolutions. He had no doubt the members of Congress knew the public will, but he would make assurance doubly sure.

Mr. B. Hardin said he knew that many of our members in Congress were inclined to vote for Mr. Adams, and he believed he would get the vote of Kentucky unless this House acted. He recapitulated the strength of Adams and Jackson, and believed the result of the Presidential election depended on the vote of Kentucky, and probably on the vote of this House, on this day.

Mr. Robertson added a few remarks, in which he declared that the resolutions would not only degrade our respected fellow-citizen, but throw Kentucky upon the electioneering arena in Congress, completely handcuffed. He was not the advocate of Adams, or any other man. He objected to this course, because it was instructing our members in Congress to do that which we believe they will do. He had no doubt the people of Kentucky were in favor of Gen. Jackson, but he was against all interference by this Legislature.

Mr. Kennedy differed with his colleague; he should vote for the resolutions. He would do it because he had confidence in our members of Congress, and believed that they would vote tho will of the people, when they knew it.

Mr Galloway moved to strike out the name of Mr. Crawford, as one before whom the resolutions prefer General Jackson. Crawford was his second choice, and Jackson his third. The motion was negatived by a very large majority.

Mr. Crosby offered in lieu of the resolutions, a substitute, requiring the Governor to send on to the Senators and Representatives in Congress a list of the votes given for President in this State. His reason was, that he thought our members of Congress ought to have all the information that could be given on this subject, and to be left to act on their own responsibility, without the interference of the Legislature. It was rejected. The first resolution, requesting our Representatives in Congress to vote for Gen. Jackson, was adopted—Yeas 69, Nays 21.

Mr. Green moved to strike out so much of the second resolution as declares that a large majority of the people of Kentucky are in favor of General Jackson, and that the Representatives in Congress will truly represent the people by voting for him. Mr. G. was in favor of General Jackson, but he was unwilling to go further than to express our preference.

After a few remarks in favor of the amendment, by Mr. Coleman, it was decided in the negative, Ayes 35, Nays 51.

The second resolution was then adopted—Yeas 73, Nays 11.

From the Frankfort (Ky.) Argus.

THE BARGAIN—MORE PROOF.

A friend has sent us the following affidavits of FOURTEEN respectable citizens of Lewis county, confirming the evidence already adduced, of Mr. David Trimble's confessions, in relation to his vote for Mr. Adams. It will be seen that they were all taken before the late pretended investigation in our Senate, which, notwithstanding the arts of Mr. Clay's managers, has filled his partisans every where with dismay.

We have no doubt that more than a HUNDRED respectable men can be found who will confirm this testimony, in its fullest extent. We expect shortly to receive other proofs of a most authentic character.

We, the subscribers, certify on oath, that we were severally present at the Lewis county court, for October, 1825, and heard David Trimble make a speech, and he used the following language: "When *we* went on last fall, to the city of Washington, we found Mr. Crawford out of the question; the contest was between General Jackson and John Quincy Adams; we ascertained that, under no circumstances, would General Jackson appoint our friend, Henry Clay, Secretary of State; we ascertained that Mr. Adams would appoint our friend, Henry Clay, Secretary of State. Knowing this, then, fellow-citizens, that Gen. Jackson would not, and Mr. Adams would, appoint our friend, Henry Clay, Secretary of State, if you expected me to vote for General Jackson, you expected me to do that which I could not, and would not do."

Signed, *Jacob Frizzle*, *Jesse Hamrick*,
Henry Halbert, *John Griffith*,
David C. Heath, *William Davis*,
William Coffrin, *HezekiahGriffith*,
Richard Pell, *Wm. Hamblin*,
John Hendrick, *David Tonkry*.

I certify, that, personally appeared before me, a Justice of the Peace for Lewis county, Jacob Frizzle, David C. Heath, William Coffrin, and Richard Pell, and made oath to the truth of the above statement. Given under my hand, this 2d day of November, 1827.

Signed, HENRY HALBERT, J. P. L. C.

I, Thomas Marshall, a Justice of the Peace for the county of Lewis, and State of Kentucky, certify, that Henry Halbert, John Hendrick, and Jesse Hamrick, personally appeared before me.

and made oath to the truth of the foregoing certificate, to which their names are subscribed. Given under my hand, this 6th day of November, 1827. Signed,

THOMAS MARSHALL, J. P. L. C.

Lewis county, set.

I, William M'Cledowny, a Justice of the Peace for Lewis county, certify, that personally appeared on this day, before me, John Griffith, William Davis, and Hezekiah Griffith and made oath to the foregoing certificate being correct. Hezekiah Griffith, further states, that he was induced to pay particular attention to that part of Trimble's speech in consequence of his being *flunched* by some person, he thinks by William Hamblin, who observed, "Listen to that." Hezekiah Davis replied, "If I had a gun I would shoot him." Given under my hand, this 18th of November, 1827.

Signed,

WILLIAM M'CLEDOWNY. J. P. L. C.

State of Kentucky, Lewis county, set.

Personally appeared before me, the subscriber, a Justice of the Peace for the county aforesaid, David Tonkry, who made oath to the correctness of the above certificate, or the substance thereof. Given under my hand, this 22d day of December, 1827.

Signed, W. P. BALL, J. P. L. C.

I, Pleasant M. Savage, of the county of Lewis, certify, that I was present at a court held in Lewis county, in 1825, when David Trimble spoke, and Major Thomas Marshall replied to said Trimble; that I have a recollection of their speeches, so far as I now state, to wit: After some previous remarks, Mr. Trimble observed: "As to the late Presidential election, fellow-citizens, I was in favor of our friend and fellow-citizen, Henry Clay; but Mr. Clay was not returned to the House of Congress by the college of electors. Those who were returned, were Gen. Jackson, John Q. Adams, and Mr. Crawford. When we got to the City of Washington, we found Mr. Crawford out of the question; the contest was between Gen. Jackson and John Q. Adams. We ascertained that if Jackson was elected President, our friend, Henry Clay, would not be offered the appointment of Secretary of State, and we then ascertained that John Q. Adams would appoint our friend, Henry Clay, Secretary of State. Under those circumstances, if you expected me to vote for Gen. Jackson, you expected me to do that which I could not and would not do." I state this from my memory of the transaction. I may possibly have erred in some words: but I believe I am correct as to the substance of Mr. Trimble's speech. I have frequently spoken of this speech, and heard it repeated in substance by others, and never heard it denied until since last August election.

I also recollect Major Thomas Marshall's reply to Trimble; and he stated that Mr. Trimble's friends, Clay and Adams, would not thank him for what he, Trimble, had stated, as it established the old story of Kremer. Mr. Trimble made a short reply to Mr. Marshall, and did not deny Mr. Marshall's statement. Given under my hand, this 20th of December, 1827.

Signed, P. M. SAVAGE.

I certify, that Pleasant M. Savage made oath to the truth of the foregoing statement over his signature.

Signed, THS. MARSHALL, J. P. L. C.

I, George Rea, certify, that I heard Major Thomas Marshall state in reply to David Trimble's speech in Lewis county at the Court-house, I think in the year 1825, that the only truth Major David Trimble stated in his speech, and that he believed to be true, was, that the friends of Henry Clay voted against Gen. Jackson, because they ascertained that he would not agree to appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State; and voted in favor of Mr. Adams, because they ascertained he would appoint their friend, Mr. Clay, Secretary of State; and Marshall further stated, that Mr. Trimble's friends, Clay and Adams, would not thank him for the declaration he had made. This is as near the words as I can recollect at this time made by Thomas Marshall, and not contradicted at that time, as I heard, by Mr. Trimble.

Signed, GEO. REA.

I, Alexander Young, a Justice of the Peace for Lewis county, certify, that George Rea personally appeared before me and made oath to the foregoing certificate over his signature. Given under my hand, this 19th day of December, 1827.

Signed, ALEX. YOUNG, J. P. L. C.

I certify, that I was present at the Lewis county court, for October, 1825, and heard David Trimble deliver a speech for the purpose of justifying himself for his vote on the Presidential election. After some preliminary remarks, he came to the Presidential election in the following language, as well as I can recollect it: "I was in the first place in favor of our friend and fellow citizen, Henry Clay; but Mr. Clay was not returned to Congress by the college of electors; those that were returned were Gen. Jackson, John Q Adams, and Mr. Crawford. When we went out last fall to the city of Washington, we found Mr. Crawford out of the question; he stood no chance; the contest was between Gen. Jackson and Mr. Adams. We ascertained that Gen. Jackson would not appoint our friend, Henry Clay, Secretary of State, and Mr. Adams would appoint our friend, Henry Clay, Secretary of State—that office being the step-stone to the Presidency. Knowing this, then, fellow citizens, if you expected me to vote for Gen. Jackson, you expected me to do that which I could not, and would not do." I speak more confidently on the subject, because, at the very time Mr. Trimble used the above language, Major Thomas Marshall elbowed me, and made some observations on that part of Mr. Trimble's speech. I state further, that I have been in the habit of repeating this part of Mr. Trimble's speech from the time of its delivery until the present time. Given under my hand, this 21st day of December, 1827.

Signed, A. DUKE.

No. 2.

WASHINGTON CITY, March 4th, 1828.

Sir: I have received your letter of the 1st instant, propounding to me certain interrogatories. After a perusal of Mr. Clay's late address to the public, it would be affectation to say, that I did not anticipate a call of this character from some of the friends of Gen. Jackson. In the nature of that publication, I have a suffi-

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH....*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published, weekly until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, MAY 10, 1828. No. 13.

Appendix to the Reply of the Jackson Corresponding Committee of the District of Columbia, to Mr. Clay's last Address.

[CONCLUDED.]

cient apology, if any were wanting, for promptly complying with your request. Without, however, pretending to give specific answers to each of your interrogatories, I shall give a simple narrative of facts and circumstances, leaving their application to you and the public.

During the late contest for the Presidency, before the people, I was the warm and zealous friend of Mr. Clay. I regarded his election as important to the whole United States, and especially to the people of the western country, with whose political principles he had harmonized, and with whose local interests his pretensions appeared to be peculiarly identified. The information given me by Mr. Clay and his friends, and my own sanguine temperament, induced me to believe that his prospects were equally favorable with those of any other of the candidates; and, much more so than those of Gen. Jackson, until Oct. 1824. In that month, Mr. Clay, Mr. Trimble, Mr. C. A. Wickliffe, myself, and perhaps other members of the Kentucky delegation, casually met at Frankfort during the session of the Court of Appeals. There Mr. Clay, for the first time, expressed to me an apprehension that he should be excluded from the House of Representatives; and observed, with seeming carelessness of manner, that it would be best for *us*, in that case, to remain uncommitted as to our second choice. This remark made but a slight impression on my mind at the time, and in November I proceeded to Washington City, still entertaining the hope that Mr. Clay would be one of the three returned to the House of Representatives.

After my arrival in the city, I was confined to my room by indisposition. While in this situation, Mr. Clay called, and after the usual civilities, told me, in emphatic terms, that he had little doubt he was excluded from the House of Representatives, and that all "we" (meaning the Kentucky delegation in Congress) "had now to do, was to hold ourselves uncommitted, as to our second choice," declaring, "that we could vote for either of the three candidates, and justify ourselves to our constituents."

At this time I was much devoted to Mr. Clay, and very unwilling to incur his displeasure. I perceived, or thought I perceived his object, and immediately sent for my colleague and confidential friend, Major R. P. Henry, and also for Col. R. M. Johnson, of the Senate, and apprized them of the remarks of Mr. Clay. Col. Johnson remarked, that if we had made up our minds, we had better frankly and openly avow our intentions at once. Major Henry detailed a similar conversation which had taken place between himself and Mr. Clay, and concurred in the propriety of an immediate avowal. We accordingly declared our determination to vote for Gen. Jackson, and thus avoided a repetition of such suggestions from Mr Clay.

I had no further intercourse with Mr. Clay on the subject of the election, until after it was over, except that which will be explained in a subsequent part of this letter. I was warmly attached to Mr. Clay, and decidedly hostile to Mr. Adams. I had denounced him in all parts of the district represented by me, on the authority of facts derived from Mr. Clay. Disappointed in my first choice, and in bad health, I took little or no part in the canvass among the members of Congress, and gave a silent vote, in accordance, as I thought, with the wishes of the people of Kentucky.

In relation to the other topics embraced in your note, they involve much delicacy; but having spoken of them, I feel it incumbent on me to prevent all misrepresentation by a statement of the truth. Soon after the meeting of Congress, my friend, Gen. Call, for the purpose of satisfying me of the state of public sentiment in Kentucky, in relation to the Presidential election, *showed* me a letter from Mr. J. J. Crittenden, saying, "I hope you will be able to make the General beat the Yankee;" and soon after, Mr. Francis Johnson *read* to me, and also to another member of Congress, a letter from Mr. J. J. Crittenden, purporting to be an answer to a letter from Mr. Johnson to Mr Crittenden, in which Mr Crittenden informed Mr. Johnson, that Gen. Jackson was his (Mr. C.'s) first choice after Mr. Clay; but, that if Mr. Adams would appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State, or place him in his cabinet, I am not certain which expression was used, then it would be an easy task to reconcile his constituents to a vote in favor of Mr. Adams.

I received two letters from a confidential friend of Mr. Clay's, residing in Kentucky, urging me to vote for whoever would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State, and intimating that Mr. Adams would do it. Mr. Clay happened to see me receive one of the letters, and after I had read it, asked me what news from Kentucky: I replied, that I had received a letter from ———. Mr. Clay asked—And what does ——— say? I replied, "You know very well." He laughed, and left me under the impression that he did know. A few days after, the intention of Mr. Clay, with that of a majority of the Kentucky delegation, to vote for Mr. Adams, was publicly announced. My colleague, John T. Johnson, Esq. desired me to accompany him to the room of our colleague, David White, Esq.; I did so; soon after our arrival, Mr. Johnson mentioned the rumour which was abroad, as to the vote of Kentucky, and asked Mr. White whether it was true, expressing, at the same time, a hope that it was not. Mr. White replied, in substance, that he did not wish to be annoyed; that "he

was not about to vote for Mr. Adams, but for Mr. Clay; that he had good authority for his vote, and knew what he was about." Here I interrupted the conversation, and Mr. Johnson and myself withdrew. The impression made upon my mind, and, as I understood, upon Mr. Johnson's, was, that Mr. White knew that Mr. Clay was to be made Secretary of State by Mr. Adams, in case of his election, and expected that this arrangement would reconcile the people of his district to his vote. Mr. John Scott, of Missouri, who boarded with me at Brown's hotel, again and again remarked to me and others, that he had not voted for Mr. Adams, but for Mr. Clay. In regard to the conversations had with two other members of Congress, referred to in your letter, I have to observe, that their letters, published in Mr Clay's address, authorizes the belief that they would negative my statement, and as the conversations occurred when there was no one present, I deem it proper not to relate them.

These are some of the facts and circumstances which led to the declaration made in my Harrodsburg address, last June, to which you have referred; other facts which have been long since communicated to me, and which contributed to form my opinion, will be furnished by other gentlemen.

T. P. MOORE.

Gen. John P. Van Ness,
Chairman Central Committee.

No. 3.

Washington, March 14th, 1828.

Jno. P. Van Ness, Esq.

Sir: Your letter, as Chairman of the Committee for the District of Columbia, requesting me to state the conversation which I had with Henry Clay, Esq. in the month of October, 1824, at Frankfort, Ky., has been handed to me.

In October, 1824, (the day is not recollected,) I visited Frankfort, Kentucky, and was in attendance upon the Court of Appeals. Mr. Clay and myself walked out of the court room together, and commenced a conversation upon the subject of his prospects in the approaching election. We entered pretty much at large upon the subject. My inquiries were more particularly directed to his prospects of getting a portion of the votes of the State of New York, having formed the opinion that unless Mr. Clay could receive a portion of the votes of that State, he would not be returned as one of the three highest candidates. Mr. Clay replied, that his friends in that State had it in contemplation, if it were practicable, to unite with the friends of Mr. Crawford, and divide the votes between himself and Crawford. Of the success of this project he spoke doubtfully, and remarked that he did not place much reliance upon the result. In the event it should fail, it is more than probable, said he, I may be excluded from the House of Representatives. To meet such a contingency, my friends must be prepared, and I think it best that they should not hastily commit themselves in their second choice. I saw Mr. Clay no more until his arrival at Washington. Nothing passed between us, upon the subject of the election, after his arrival at Washington, until after the Kentucky resolutions were received, and it was generally known he had avowed his determination to vote for Mr. Adams. On one or two occasions, the votes we were about to give was the subject of conversation, in the course of which Mr. Clay pointed out the objections which he had to General Jackson's election.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. A. WICKLIFFE.

No. 4.

Washington City, April 4, 1828.

Sir: The communication which you, as Chairman of the Jackson Corresponding Committee, addressed to me, was received. In answer to which, I have to state:

That during the session of Congress in 1824-5, whilst the election of President of the United States was then before the House of Representatives, I called to see Mr. Clay, to ascertain, if possible, his determination as it related to his voting for Mr. Crawford, in whose favor I then was, and had been from the commencement of the contest, as Mr. Clay knew, and I believe every body else who was acquainted with me.

I think this was in the month of January of that year, or the latter part of the preceding month, December. Mr. Clay, in the course of conversation, said to me, that he had called on Mr. Crawford, as soon as he arrived in the city, to satisfy himself, and be his own judge as to the state of his health; and that he was thoroughly convinced, from seeing him, that it would not do to elect him; that his health was so bad he could not discharge the duties of the office if he were elected.

He then went on to state, in the course of that conversation, and I think nearly in these words: "When I take up the pretensions of Mr. Adams, and weigh them, and lay them down—then take up the pretensions of General Jackson, weigh them, and lay them down by the side of those of Mr. Adams—I never was as much puzzled in all my life, as I am to decide between them."

In answer to the other part of your inquiry, permit me to say, that I have had many conversations with Mr. Clay, of a political character, the nature and extent of which I am unwilling to disclose, unless some future circumstance should authorize or require it.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN FLOYD, of Virginia.

Gen. J. P. Van Ness,
Chairman Corresponding Committee.

No. 6.

Smith's Point, Charles County, Md.
March 24th, 1828.

To Gen. J. P. Van Ness.

Sir: In answer to the inquiry proposed by the Jackson Corresponding Committee, of which you are Chairman, as to a conversation which passed between the late Hon. Robert P. Henry, of Kentucky, and myself, in the month of January, or the early part of February, 1825, I will state, in substance, his observations, in relation to the Presidential election, then pending before the House of Representatives of the United States. I will observe,

that Major Henry landed at my house from the steam-boat, which was carrying the President and other gentlemen to the "N. Carolina" man-of-war, then lying near the mouth of the Potomac. This circumstance will ascertain the period of the visit and conversation. In answer to some inquiry of mine, as to what would be the probable result of the election by the House, Mr. Henry stated, that General Jackson might have obtained the vote of Kentucky, if he had authorized or permitted his friends to have given Mr. Clay or his friends an assurance that Mr. Clay should, upon his election, be made Secretary of State. That the time had now passed—that Mr. Adams would receive the vote of Kentucky—that the attachment of a large number of her delegates to Mr. Clay, would lead them to vote for Mr. Adams, in order to advance the political interests of their favorite (Mr. C.)—that he (Mr. H.) had warmly supported the election of Mr. Clay; but, under existing circumstances, he should not hesitate to obey the will of the people of his State, who were now, and at all times, opposed to Mr. Adams, since he was first announced as a candidate for the Presidency—that no doubt existed, but that General Jackson was second only to Mr. Clay in the estimation and attachment of the people of Kentucky—and was, at the present time, the object of their decided political preference and hopes.

The above is substantially a correct statement of Mr. Henry's remarks, to the best of my recollection. I have, as requested by your Committee, made oath to my statement, as I am sure I have given the substance of Mr. Henry's observations. I know I would not designedly pervert them for all this world can bestow.

I have the honor to be, most respectfully, your very obedient servant, A. GREER.

Sworn to, before me, one of the Associate Judges for the first Judicial District of the State of Maryland. EDMUND KEY.

No. 6.

TALLAHASSEE, *February 4th*, 1828.

SIR: Mr. Clay in his address to the *public*, has done me the honor to mentinn my name in the following manner: "It can scarcely be doubted that General Call was well acquainted with Gen. Jackson's views and expectations. At a tavern at Rockville, in Maryland, about fifteen miles from this city, during that same journey, Gen. Call and several other gentlemen engaged in conversation about the Presidential election. John Braddock, Esq. (a gentleman not known to me, but who, I understand, is a merchant of great respectability,) was present; and he states, that "when the vote which Mr. Clay would probably give, was spoken of, Gen. Call declared that the friends of Gen. Jackson did not expect Mr. Clay to vote for him, and if he did so, it would be an act of duplicity on his part."

I have no knowledge of the person on whose authority Mr. Clay has made this statement, neither do I recollect, or believe, that I ever made the remark attributed to me, on that occasion: on the contrary, I am confident that the assertion is without the least foundation. Rockville, I understand, is the name of the village at Montgomery Court-house, Maryland. My travelling companions, when I arrived at that place, in 1824, were Messrs. John T. Johnson, of Kentucky, Stewart, of Pennsylvania, and Vinton, of Ohio; the last two gentlemen were, and I believe are still, the personal and political friends of Mr. Clay, and I call upon them to state, whether they heard me at Rockville, or at any other place, make use of the language mentioned by Mr. Clay. With those gentlemen I associated on terms of intimacy; we had been travelling companions from Cumberland, where I had left Gen. Jackson; and our conversations were indulged with unreserved freedom. They had a much better opportunity of learning my opinions on any subject, than the strange gentleman on whose authority Mr. Clay has rested; and I am convinced, that neither of them will say the statement is true. In addition to my want of recollection of having made the remarks ascribed to me, I have other and stronger reasons for believing that I did not do so.

I arrived at Rockville on Sunday, the day preceding the meeting of Congress; at that time the result of the election, in Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Louisiana, where the friends of Mr. Clay claimed a majority, was unknown, and it was impossible to decide whether Mr. Clay or Mr. Crawford would be returned to the House of Representatives with Gen. Jackson and Mr. Adams: this question was not decided until many weeks after the commencement of the session. Is it then reasonable that I should speak of the vote to be given by Mr. Clay, at a time when there was the greatest probability that he would be a candidate, instead of an elector in the House? But, Sir, if my opinion on that important subject be of the least interest, permit me, and I will here record it faithfully.

I did most confidently believe, that if Mr. Clay failed to reach the House as a candidate, that he would vote for General Jackson. I believed, not from his personal or political partiality for Gen Jackson, but because I believed that nineteen-twentieths of the people of Kentucky preferred Gen. Jackson to Mr. Adams. I knew him (Mr. Clay) to have been the zealous advocate of the right of instruction. I knew him to be a Western man; and I had listened with delight and enthusiasm on many occasions when he described the wants, the sufferings, and the neglect of the "poor West." How then could I doubt that he would vote for the Western candidate, who was the choice of the State he represented? Had I have doubted it on the Sunday preceding, on the Wednesday succeeding the meeting of Congress that doubt would have been removed.

As Gen. Jackson, Major Eaton, and myself were returning from the Capitol, after passing through the Rotundo, we were overtaken by Mr. Clay, who approached Gen. Jackson with his usual pleasing address, and with the following familiar and friendly language: "General Jackson, I have a *quarrel* with you: why did you not let me know that you were coming by Lexington? I certainly should have waited for your arrival." And to the best of my recollection, he added, "We should have travelled to-

gether." Indeed, Sir, I never doubted but that Mr. Clay and his friends, generally, would vote for Gen. Jackson, until a gentleman, in whose sagacity and means of being correctly informed, I had much confidence, suggested to me, that from his knowledge of the value which Mr. Clay set upon the office of Secretary of State, and its patronage, that he was convinced that Mr. Clay had determined to dispose of his interest in a manner that would secure him that station. I replied, that I knew nothing of the views of Gen. Jackson on that subject; that it was one on which his best friends could not approach him. The gentleman then observed, "without pretending to have more sagacity than others, I venture to say, that Gen. Jackson will not be elected."

I own that I was greatly surprised at this remark, for I had believed, until then, the election of the General beyond the possibility of a doubt. But, before we separated, the gentleman convinced me that the election was completely in the hands of Mr. Clay. I do not recollect at what period I received this information. It was, however, long before the publication of Mr. Kremer's letter to the editor of the Columbian Observer, and I had time to write to General Paine, of Mount Sterling, Kentucky, and to receive an answer before the election. In my letter to General Paine, I informed him, that a majority of the Kentucky Delegation would disregard the instructions of the Legislature, requesting them to vote for Gen. Jackson, and if the people wished to be heard on that important occasion, they should speak in a voice not to be misunderstood by the Representatives. This produced a meeting of a number of the citizens of Montgomery county, Ken., who instructed their representative, Mr. Trimble, positively to vote to Gen. Jackson. A copy of those instructions were forwarded to me, and were published in the Washington City Gazette, a few days before the election. On reference to those instructions, you will perceive something peculiar in their phraseology. They were given in anticipation of the course I had apprized General Paine would be pursued by the Kentucky delegation.

Before I conclude, permit me to mention a conversation which I had with Mr. Brent, of Louisiana. This gentleman, between whom and myself there had been no particular intimacy, gave me the first intelligence I received of the vote of Louisiana. He sought the interview, and after communicating the fact, remarked, that Mr. Clay was out of the question. I observed to him, your State appears to be in favor of Gen. Jackson: what will be the vote of her delegation when the question comes before the House? He replied, "*vox populi vox Dei*," is my motto. A few days after, in enumerating the States which would probably vote for Gen. Jackson, Mr. Brent mentioned Louisiana.—Soon, however, after this, he became more distant, and we did not converse on the Presidential question again, until a few moments after the balloting, which resulted in the election of Mr. Adams. I then met Mr. Brent, and observed to him, Sir, *vox populi* is not *vox Dei!* The gentleman understood my allusion, and replied, that he had no instructions from his district, and that he had been left in the dark with regard to the wishes of the people. I told him, that I wished only to remind him, that *vox populi* was not always *vox Dei*, and we separated. I mention this circumstance, as an evidence of the correctness of the information I had received of the views and determination of Mr Clay. That he did hold the election in his own hands, is proved by the result. That he is in the cabinet is equally clear; and that Mr. Brent was instrumental in placing him there, none will doubt. By what magical artifice he seduced the worthy representative of Louisiana from his allegiance and his motto, he best can tell. If an apology is due for this intrusion, I hope it will be found in the manner in which I have been brought before the public by Mr. Clay.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
R. K. CALL

Gen. JOHN P. VAN NESS.

No. 7.

WASHINGTON CITY, April, 1828.

SIR: In reply to your letter requesting such information as I may be possessed of, relative to the Presidential election in 1824–5, I have but little to remark. Concerning the events of that period, I have no material facts to communicate: opinions are of little value, and withal, are not asked for. I shall do no more, therefore, than notice a few of the statements contained in Mr. Clay's late pamphlet, and to state their want of accuracy.

It is not true, as Mr. Clay has asserted, that I wrote the letter avowed by Mr. Kremer to be his, and which was published in the Columbian Observer, in January, 1825, in which it is charged that Mr. Clay would vote for Mr. Adams, and as compensation for his vote, was to be, and would be, appointed Secretary of State. Directly or indirectly, I had no agency in it; and never saw, nor heard of the letter, until I read it in the columns of the Columbian Observer.

It is not true, as asserted by Mr. Clay, that a dinner was gotten up with a view to produce reconciliation between himself and Gen. Jackson, where, as he says, they "met, exchanged salutations, and dined together;" and whore, dinner being over, he "was followed to the door by General Jackson and Mr. Eaton, who insisted on my taking a seat in their carriage." These statements and assertions are worthy to be marvelled at. They are incorrect.

In the first place, this dinner party, to which he has referred for effect, was intended as mere civility to those who were invited—nothing more. I had the honor to be one of the guests on the occasion, and so considered it. Mr. Isacks and Mr. Blair, the only members from Tennessee, now present, who then were here, know it to have been designed in no other way, and so declare. Neither of them possess the slightest recollection of the conversation charged by Mr. Clay to have taken place at the time they called to see him; yet he will have it, and so insinuates, that the call and the dinner were mere matters *ad captandum;* for, says he, there "we met, exchanged salutations, and dined together." His memory, either through accident or design, must indeed be short, not to have remembered that some time before the

happening of this *motive* dinner, he had actually seen Gen. Jackson—yes, "met and exchanged salutations."

A few days after the meeting of Congress, in December, 1823, I was requested by General Jackson to walk with him to see Mrs. Watson, an acquaintance of his, a widow lady, in this city. Very shortly after entering the house, and being seated, Mr. Clay came in. From the very limited time we had been in the house, I felt confident he had seen us enter, and knew Gen. Jackson to be there. I advanced and spoke to him, and immediately Mrs. Watson introduced him to the General. "Here they met, and exchanged salutations;" nay more, conversed freely and friendly together; and yet Mr. Clay will have it, their difference abided, and that it was not until this electioneering dinner was gotten up at Mr. Claxton's, that they "met, and exchanged salutations."

But from the dinner, it seems, he was "followed to the door by General Jackson and Mr. Eaton, who insisted on my taking a seat in their carriage;" and this is presented as evidence of a disposition to woo and win his favors and good opinion.

Let it be borne in mind, that at this period of the Presidential history, January, 1824, Mr. C. was exclusively for himself, and not to be won to the interest of any candidate, save himself. The dinner over, several had retired into the parlor; I am confident that General Jackson retired first—not that I pretend to recollect such a trifling and unimportant matter, but because, as most of his acquaintances know, it was his constant practice to avail himself of the earliest opportunity to leave a dinner table. Abstemious in diet, and drinking not at all, is, I presume, the reason why. Several gentlemen were about to retire from the parlor at the same time: the General's carriage was at the door; as he, Gen. Call, Delegate from Florida, who, I think, was of our party, and myself, were about to depart; Mr. Clay was standing on the piazza, General Jackson politely offered him a seat, and it was politely accepted. Mr. Clay was set down at his lodgings; we proceeded home; and this is the sum and substance of that unimportant matter, which Mr. Clay has offered as so very material.

The interview of Mr. Buchanan with me is already before the public, and need not be here again adverted to. In my communication during the last summer, on the subject, I presented an extract of a letter, but gave not the name of the writer. It was written by John M'Lane, who, in 1824-5, was a Senator from the State of Illinois. It is here annexed.

Very respectfully, J. H. EATON.

Extract from a letter written by the Hon. John McLane, of Illinois, to Mr. Eaton.

"The bargain of 1825, between Messrs. Adams and Clay, I remember well, was freely spoken of by many members of Congress, although I had no personal knowledge of any fact which would warrant the belief *that the contract existed;* besides the high estimation in which I then held Mr. Clay, forbade my suspicions on any accusations not supported by *positive proof;* that proof was not afforded me, and I held him guiltless; yet there were *some circumstances of unfavorable appearance, and which, as the friend of Mr. Clay, I was sorry had existence.* The circumstances to which I allude, were the *continued silence and lengthy reserve of Mr. Clay's friends, in publishing or letting it be known how they would vote; and the fact that the Kentucky delegation, who voted for Mr. A., had a meeting to determine upon their course, as I was informed by one of them, at which, it was said to me, that upon the question being proposed to Mr. Clay, for whom shall we vote?* he answered, in substance, "*that in case General Jackson should be elected, he believed that the administration, with its weight, would be opposed to him, to prostrate him;* that, should Mr. A. be elected, he felt satisfied it would not be so, *but that he hoped no personal consideration for him, would induce them to act contrary to their desire.*" Upon these circumstances, I have often remarked, that the first was *in character of Kentuckians; that the last was the strongest appeal which could be made to a man's friends, and the heaviest requisition which could be levied on their attachment.*"

WASHINGTON, January 3, 1828.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of this date, requesting to be informed of the substance of a conversation which passed betwixt the Hon. Mr. Scott of Missouri, and myself, relative to the last Presidential election, is just received.

The conversation alluded to, took place on the evening of the 22d of February, 1825, betwixt the times of the election and the accession of the present Chief Magistrate. Before the election, it had been currently reported that Mr. Clay was to receive the office of Secretary of State, provided Mr. Adams should be elected; and that, in consideration of this arrangement, the friends of Mr. Clay had determined to give Mr. Adams their support. This report I had no reason to disbelieve, especially as the Hon. Francis Johnson, of Kentucky, a warm friend of Mr. Clay, had told me, a short time antecedent to the rumor, that he had determined to give a blank vote, as he could not give his suffrage to either of the candidates which would be returned; but immediately on the rumor that such was to be the result of Mr. Adams' election, I found him, Mr. F. Johnson, enlisted among his supporters. Though Mr. Clay repelled with indignation the insinuation that *he* had been accessary to such an arrangement, yet I did not then doubt, nor did I suppose it was denied, that *his friends* were influenced by it. It was under this impression that I entered into the conversation with Mr. Scott. It occurred as a common topic, and not as a subject sought, or having any special design, with either of us. I asked him if his vote would be popular in Missouri? He answered, that nineteen-twentieths of his constituents would be opposed to it. I then inquired what would be said of him when he returned home? He replied that his vote would make a great noise for a time; but that their election was over, and they could not touch him under two years, and in that time the excitement would probably subside. He added, that it was ascertained if Mr. Adams should not be elected on the first ballot, he could not be elected afterwards; that if *he* had not voted for him, Mr. Cook, of Illinois, would not have voted for him, and that without both of their votes, he would not have been

elected. I then remarked, that as the election had depended upon him, I supposed, in case of his own failure at the next election, he would be otherwise provided for. To this he answered, that he would accept of no appointment whatever under the administration of Mr. Adams, lest it should be regarded as the reward of his vote. I asked him how he could then expect Mr. Clay to accept the appointment of Secretary of State, as it was rumored that it was to be tendered to him, in case of Mr. Adams' election, and I supposed it would be expected that Mr. Clay would accept it. He remarked, that Mr. Clay did not act for himself, but for the West. That Mr. Clay was the man of the West. "We," said he, (alluding, as I supposed, to the western members who voted for Mr. Adams,) "act for the West, and Mr. Clay is our man. He must not consider himself as Mr. Clay, but as the West, and in that character it will be his duty to accept."

This was ten days before the inauguration of Mr. Adams. I had not heard that the office was then already tendered to Mr. Clay, nor do I know whether it was; but from the report which had been circulated before the election, connected with the simultaneous movement of some of Mr. Clay's friends, I assumed the conclusion as a matter of course, that he was to receive the appointment; and the whole of Mr. Scott's conversation appeared to me to admit the fact, on the principle of my assumption. Whether such was his design, I know not; but such was the impression which it could not fail to make on my mind.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, Sir, your obedient servant,

O. B. BROWN.

Hon. J. H. Eaton.

No. 8.

Washington City, *April* 30, 1828.

Dear Sir: In answer to your inquiries, I can truly say, that my letter to the Columbian Observer, of the 25th January, 1825, announcing the treason that then threatened the Republic, was written at my desk, pending the session of the House; where I wrote several others of similar character.

It would be an unnecessary waste of time for me to furnish any additional evidence, to prove the truth of the charges contained in my letter. Indeed Mr. Clay has not, nor can he, meet the charges contained in it. He has endeavored to evade the charge, by creating an impression that I was not the author of the letter to the Columbian Observer; and that General Jackson, or Major Eaton, had written the letter. I can and would declare, if arraigned before that tribunal from whence there is no appeal, that neither of the gentlemen could have had any knowledge of the letter until it was published in print.—Nothing can be more destitute of truth than this attempt of Mr. Clay.

Respectfully, your fellow-citizen,

G. KREMER.

Gen. Van Ness, *Chair'n, &c.*

No. 9.

Washington, *March 22d*, 1828.

Sir: Your letter, dated 20th instant, accompanied by an address of the Central Committee of Correspondence, of which you are the Chairman, was received on yesterday. You solicit such information as I may possess on the subjects of which the address treats. It relates to a pamphlet of Mr. Clay, in which, as is supposed, he "has undertaken to show that Gen. Jackson and his friends practised seductive arts to prevail upon him, Mr. Clay, to favor the views of Gen. Jackson in the election to the Presidency; and that when their efforts failed, he, General Jackson, conspired with Mr. Eaton and Mr. Kremer to intimidate Mr. Clay, and to deter him from voting for Mr. Adams; that General Jackson in speaking of the events of the late Presidential election, has been guilty of misrepresentation, with a view to impress on the public mind, prejudice against Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay; and lastly, that he, Mr. Clay, previous to the election, had no understanding whatever, that he would be appointed Secretary of State in the event that Mr. Adams were elected."

I possess very little, if any, information, relating to either of these subjects, which can be of use, on either side of the question.

During the session of Congress, in the years 1823 and 1824, I was in the City of Washington, then acting as one of the Commissioners, under the Florida treaty; in the course of the winter, I was invited by some of the members of Congress, from my own State, to dine with their mess, at Mrs. Claxton's. Neither at the time of receiving the invitation, nor until I went to dine, had I any knowledge, or intimation, that any *other person* had been invited to dine with them on the *same day*. At dinner, I found General Jackson, Mr. Clay, and some other gentlemen, who did not belong to the mess, and therefore presumed they, as well as myself, were invited guests. I neither saw, nor heard, before the dinner, at the dinner, nor after the dinner, any thing which induced me to believe there was any political or electioneering movement, in any way connected with it. Indeed the mixed political character of the company would seem to forbid such a supposition; as among the guests were some of the most decided and discerning friends of a third candidate, who was not present.

When dinner was over, and the guests took their leave, I do not remember to have noticed whether any two or more went away in company with each other or not; as I did not board at the same house with any of them, I went home alone.

Most respectfully, your obed't servant,

HU. L. WHITE.

Gen. John P. Van Ness, *Chairman.*

No. 10.

March 25th, 1828.

Gen. J. P. Van Ness:

Sir: In reply to your note of the 20th, I have to say, that early in the session of 1823–4, I visited Mr. Clay, in person, not by card—the custom being to call on the Speaker, as I had heard, for I was a new member, and so were my colleagues, except two. It is my impression, that some of them were in company, but who, or how many, I cannot state. If there were any thing remarkable in this visit, I neither discov-

ed nor noticed it. I am convinced the dinner business was not then thought of, neither was a reconciliation between Gen. Jackson and Mr. Clay, nor any other political movement, intended, by it, so far as I knew. We just called to see the Speaker. What! we undertake to manage Mr. Clay by a visit and a dinner? Ridiculous! I have no recollection of any such conversation as that represented by Mr. Clay in his pamphlet, nor do I remember what we talked about. Some weeks after this, we concluded to give a dinner at our boarding house, to Gen. Jackson. The whole Tennessee delegation did not board together, and there were in the mess gentlemen from two other States. Previous to this time, I had heard the fact spoken of, and think it was generally understood, that General Jackson and Mr. Clay had met, exchanged civilities, and appeared mutually disposed to forget former personal differences. The dinner was not given to bring General Jackson and Mr. Clay together, for the first time, on terms of "respectful intercourse," as intimated by Mr. Clay. I am well assured, that that had taken place before. But it gives me pleasure to state, for myself, (find fault who may) that I felt gratified by contributing, in any degree, even by the dinner civility, to the continuation of that intercourse. The presiding officers of both houses of Congress, gentlemen from several States, and, as it happened, friends of all the candidates for President, (if I am not mistaken,) were of the party. Three gentlemen from Tennessee, not members of Congress, the First Comptroller, Judge Anderson, Judge White, and Gen. Gaines, were also present. This civility was repaid by Mr. Clay, a few days after, in kind. I would spurn, even now, to impute that act of hospitality, on his part, to any unworthy motive—although I might be invited to do so, if the principles of retaliation were alone to be consulted.

I am, with great respect, yours, &c.

J. C. ISACKS.

No. 11.

WASHINGTON CITY, April 9th, 1828.

SIR: Yours of the 20th ult. accompanying an address to the public, made by order of the Central Corresponding Committee, of this city, was received, in which you request me to contribute such information as I may possess relative to the subject of which it treats. As I am one of the only two now present, who were of the Tennessee delegation in 1823-4, and as Mr. Clay has charged that delegation with seductive arts, to bring about a reconciliation between General Jackson and himself, I esteem it due to myself, and an act of justice to my then colleagues, to state, that during the session of 1823-4, the Tennessee delegation, except Col. Allen and the two Senators, with the Hon. David Barton, of Missouri, and Gen. Leftwich, of Virginia, boarded at Mrs. Claxton's, and as a mark of respect for Gen. Jackson, gave him the dinner to which Mr. Clay has alluded. To that dinner the President pro tem. of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with several other members, and Judge White of Tennessee, then one of the Board of Commissioners for Spanish claims, were invited. I can say, with confidence, that no other motive induced the invitation given to Mr. Clay, than a respectful civility intended to be shown to the presiding officer of the House, of which most of our mess were members. For myself, I can say, that I never conversed with Mr. Clay in relation to the Lebanon affair, to which he has been pleased to refer in his pamphlet, nor did either of my then colleagues in my presence; nor had I heard of the cause of coolness between the General and Mr. Clay at Lebanon, until after the dinner. I repeat, that dinner was not given by the Tennessee delegation alone, nor had they the exclusive selection of the guests: it was given, as I believe, without the knowledge of Gen. Jackson, until invited, and without the remotest intention of affecting any other object, than an expression of kind feelings towards the individual on whose account it was given. I regret that so common an incident here, should have been seized upon as the ground of intrigue on our part, than which nothing is more incorrect; as I feel confident those gentlemen before named, who were not of the delegation, and who were at the time favoring the pretensions of other candidates for the Presidency, will attest.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

JOHN BLAIR.

Gen. JOHN P. VAN NESS.

No. 12.

Mr. Clay has thought proper to introduce into his address a letter from Gov. Kent of Maryland, the purpose of which seems to be to afford the Secretary an opportunity to assail the Hon. Romulus Saunders, the able and eloquent representative, who had the temerity to call for information relative to the manner in which Mr. Clay had dispensed the patronage of his department. Justice to Mr. Saunders requires the insertion of an extract from his reply contradicting the statement of Gov. Kent's letter. General Saunders says:

"I know the position in which I stand, and that of the personage whose word I have to confront. But I am not the first victim selected by the parasites of the day, to divert public reprehension from their high patron; nor is Governor Kent the first man who is indebted to his station for a little brief consequence. I am charged from this "high source" of having been "decidedly in favor of Mr. Adams in preference to Gen. Jackson, and not ten minutes before the late election by the House of Representatives, to have approached him [Gov. Kent] with anxious countenance, discovering deep concern indeed, and used these emphatic words: "I hope to God you may be able to terminate the election on the first ballot, for fear we from North Carolina may be forced to vote for Gen. Jackson." His Excellency must indeed have relaxed from the cares of office for the perusal of "The Merry Wives of Windsor," or "The School for Scandal," "The Arabian Night's Entertainment," or some other work of fiction. It is to be recollected, that this "anxious countenance," this "deep concern," this "emphatic language," occurred more than two years since, on the eve of an important election, to a man occupying a different side of the House from myself, with whom I was not intimate, who had been opposed to my friends in politics, and one who I had

always viewed as concealing under a plausible exterior, the secret but deadly enmity of a viper. On an occasion, and by a man of this kind, my manner and words are professed to be remembered with accuracy, and reported with precision. The affirmative charge rests upon the ipse dixit of this pliant Governor alone. I meet it, therefore, as it ought to be met, *with the lie direct.*"

Mr. Trimble was the known friend and confidential agent of Mr. Clay. So, as it was uncertain whether Mr Clay or Mr. Crawford would be, excluded from the House, he used every effort to secure the vote of Mr. Crawford's friends, by declaring to them that Mr. Crawford was *his* second choice. It will be remembered, that Mr. Clay, in the fall of 1824, on his way to Washington, passed through Virginia, and visited the Sage of Monticello, who understood that his object was to obtain the vote of Mr. Crawford's friends. Mr. Trimble also passed through North Carolina and Virginia, and his object is fully explained by the following extract from a letter of a gentleman of the highest respectability, to the Hon. Samuel P. Carson, dated Iredell county, North Carolina—received since this Appendix was prepared for the press:

"The statement of Mr. David Trimble, of Kentucky, as published in Mr. Clay's late pamphlet, has been received here with no little surprise. Mr. Trimble passed through this place in November, 1824, the week before the election for Electors. He conversed freely with some of the known political friends of Mr. Crawford, and stated, without reserve, that the West preferred Mr. Clay, from his local situation, and for his opinions upon some matters of public policy; but in the event of his exclusion from the House of Representatives, his friends would most decidedly prefer Mr. Crawford, as their next choice. Mr. T. spoke with *horror* at the idea of being forced to choose between Mr. Adams and General Jackson. So strong and unequivocal was the language of Mr. T. that it was afterwards used by the friends of Mr. Crawford as certain evidence of the vote of Mr. Clay and friends, in the event of his being out of the question. This conversation took place between Mr. T. and some gentlemen of the bar—it being court week—and can be supported, if denied."

Here, (in the fall of 1824,) Mr. Trimble declared that Mr. Crawford was his second choice in his letter to Mr. Clay, he says that he had made up his mind to vote for Mr. Adams, as a second choice, as early as February, 1824!! Why did Mr. Trimble speak with horror at the idea of voting for either Mr. Adams or General Jackson? Is it not manifest that he hoped that Mr. Clay would be returned as one of the three candidates, and expected, by pretending to be the friend of Mr. Crawford, to induce the friends of that gentleman to vote for Mr. Clay in the House?

The Reply of the Central Committee of Correspondence of this District, to Mr. Clay's Address to the public, is this day given to our readers.

Assailed by the insidious whispers and covert insinuations of political leaders, it is not to be expected that the Committee will escape the abuse of the corps of adherents and dependent libellers whom this administration have called in to its aid.

Mr. Frank Johnson, one of the late representatives in Congress from Kentucky, one of those who was discarded by his constituents on account of his treachery to their interests, has denounced this reply in advance, and speaking of the Committee, says:

"A committee, composed entirely, I presume, of men resident in the District of Columbia, and if so, they have no voice in the Presidential election, yet they are set up as a central and controlling power, to put in motion all the schemes and plans that may be devised by themselves or others to govern and control public sentiment, for the purpose of raising General Jackson to the Presidency. Was ever so daring an outrage attempted against the liberties of the people? A few disfranchised men, who have no vote in the Presidential election, have been set up to control the nation."

It is too true, that this committee are disfranchised men: It is too true that this District is the seat of a despotic power, more odious in its features than the monarchy of Great Britain. It is too true that the people of this disfranchised District have no voice in the Presidential election; and, it is equally true, that Congress have the power to establish a religion; they have the power to regulate the press; they have the power to establish orders of nobility, within this "*disfranchised*" District. That such things have not been done, is to be attributed to the youthful vigor of our institutions, and the prevailing influence of religious toleration, and the love of liberty which the representatives of the people have brought from their constituents at home. *Let the people of the States once sanction the doctrine, that the representative is not to be palsied by the will of his constituents*; let the representatives of the people with impunity set the will of constituents at defiance, and the chains, which are already forged for the people of this District, will be riveted.

Knowing, as this Committee do, the malignant spirit of proscription and persecution which characterizes the Coalition, it requires no small degree of moral firmness to speak forth in the language of truth to the people. Let the time once arrive when such an effort shall be considered as an outrage upon the liberties of the people, and then, indeed, will there be an end of liberty.

It is known to most of our readers, that at the close of the session of Congress, in March 1827, the notorious John C. Wright issued a circular, appointing one of the Auditors of Public Accounts, and the Editor of the Journal, a committee of correspondence, on the part of the Coalition, for this district. It is known that the Journal and Intelligencer are devoted to the support of the Coalition, and from the nature of the government, the people must look to this point for information in relation to the conduct of the public functionaries. The denunciation of Mr. Johnson, extends as well to the press as to the members of the Committee—if it be wrong in the Committee to publish facts in relation to the candidates for the Presidency, it is also wrong for the press to do so. Let the people once permit

such a doctrine to be established; let them once permit the sources of intelligence to be dried up, and it will be to the body politic what the infusion of deadly poison into the heart would be to the natural body. It will be to infuse a poison into the great fountain from whence all the streams of political information are supplied. The doctrine advanced by Mr. Johnson is, that it is unauthorized, arrogant, and presuming, in the inhabitants of this District to express their sentiments, to participate in the discussions, or even to state facts, relative to the election, because they are constitutionally interdicted from any direct voice in its decision.

The fallacy of this pretence must be obvious to reflecting men. Most of the concerns of the people of the States, are managed exclusively by their local authorities—a comparatively small portion remaining to the general government. It is admitted, nevertheless, that they have a strong, if not a vital interest, in the advantageous management of that portion so remaining; and, therefore, that they have not only the legal privilege, but are even bound in duty to their country, their posterity, and themselves, vigilantly to watch over, and actively to attend to, the administration of that government and its constituted authorities.

This District, on the contrary, is under the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of Congress. *All* our interests are subject to *it* alone. We can have no relief or redress against its acts. A tyrant or an usurper, who might, by any means, obtain a controlling influence over it, unless their present institutions become sapped and enfeebled, and their population sink into a base prostitution, could practise, comparatively, but little oppression and injustice upon the people of *the States;* whilst in relation *to us* he would have no restraint. A political gambler, having that control and influence, might, for a favorite object, stake *us* upon a single throw; whilst his desperate game could not jeopardize *the States.* Is it not then palpable, that we have more at hazard from the mal-administration of the general government than the rest of our countrymen? And is it not, therefore, reasonable and natural, that we should feel a more anxious and intense interest in the election and appointment of those agents who are to rule over us?

Besides, even if a hope or anticipation of a prospective improvement of our political condition, as relates to the elective franchise, could form no legitimate consideration in our choice between opposing candidates, are we so completely separated and alienated from our fathers, our brethren, and our children, located and distributed throughout the United States, that we ought to be indifferent to their fate; to have no sympathies for them or their political concerns? We say no. Our feelings, our fortunes, and our destinies, are identified with those of the great family of the United States: and if such solicitude be not only justifiable, but laudable, are we not then to use the means in our power, in co-operation with them, to produce desirable and important results? What are those means? We cannot, indeed, operate directly upon the ballot boxes. But our local situation affords us superior opportunities and facilities for acquiring and communicating information; for detecting and exposing vice and misconduct in the public servants; for discovering and proclaiming the approach of danger to others as well as to ourselves. We can readily respond to the call of any injured portion of our country: In fine, we may usefully accord with its remote parts in salutary measures of precaution or redress. All this we certainly may do, even if we were not permitted to participate in discussions upon the theory of our Government and laws, and their practical execution and effect—a privilege not even denied to the foreign statesman or philanthropist. Mr. Johnson does not seem aware of the extent to which his doctrine would, in effect, carry him. Does he contend, for instance, that, in a State whose citizens have not the right of universal suffrage, those who are not qualified to vote, have, moreover, no right to advise with, or to communicate facts and information to, their more fortunate neighbors and friends about to exercise *that* right? And does he see no analogy in principle between that case and the one now under consideration? According to the doctrine of Mr. Johnson on the one hand, and the practice of his friends on the other, every political vagabond or bankrupt from other parts of the country is not only permitted but invited by the patronage and favor of the Executive to migrate into this city, and to append himself to the skirts of a decaying administration, for the purpose of sustaining it by his hired exertions, guided and aided by his proximity to corruption and *dictation*. The hireling presses of inhabitants of the District, are, it would seem, authorized to eulogize or to defame, with a view to the Presidential as well as other elections in the country; whilst other inhabitants, who are less accessible to corrupt means, are required to be tame spectators of passing events, to abstain from all interference in State and general elections, to kiss the rod of an usurper, to sing hosannas in his praise, and to prostrate themselves before him, without the right of disapproving or of contributing to reform or change! But the Constitution forbids us from voting. Be it so: the Constitution forbids *one act*, and we do *another*.

Without arguing any more upon this subject, it is sufficient to say, that, whilst we beheld in the north, the south, the east, and the west, our fellow countrymen (we pray Mr. Johnson to excuse the term) preparing themselves for an important contest, appointing and organizing their forces, we received, in aid of our own predisposition, such special invitations and appeals from republicans without the District, as were not to be disregarded. A public meeting was called and assembled amongst us. The committee was appointed and organized as a Central Committee of Correspondence. To prove that political intrigue, leading to usurpation, with its corrupt and deplorable consequences, on the one hand; and that unfounded accusations against General Jackson, the people's candidate, were propagated by the highest Executive Department of the Government, on the other; the committee thought it criminal to withhold what became known to them, and was within their reach, and gave a solemn pledge to the American people, which they have redeemed.

To Thomas Speed, Esq. Bardstown, Kentucky.

That Messrs. Adams, Clay, and Webster have desired to impeach my veracity, for the purpose of destroying the influence of that press, I had

known, long before you became a volunteer in their cause; but my respect for your character, and the friendly relations between us, were such, that I was not prepared for the part you have chosen to act. In your first letter to the Editor of the Commentator, you assume that an Editorial comment, in this paper, on the statements of Pleasants and Binns, relative to the slander charging that General Jackson was prevented by Commodore Decatur from committing an act of violence on Mr Eppes, in the Senate chamber, was false, and volunteer to correct it.

In the last, you complain that I did not republish your letter and Darby's statement on this subject. I regret that I have lost the paper containing your last communication, and that I am compelled to refer to the substance instead of quoting your words.

I have waited until now, that I might obtain a copy of certain depositions taken to be read in evidence in certain suits, wherein Darby is a plaintiff, originating out of publications relative to the murder of Col. Sharp: and now publish extracts which, I trust, will satisfy you, as well as an impartial public, that Darby is not a witness whose *oath* is to be put in opposition to the *word* of General Jackson.

Stephen Cantrell swears, that "he believed that Darby had committed perjury in swearing against him in a suit in the Federal court, in two instances; and that he believed Darby's general character to be that of a perjured man."

Nath. McNary, Clerk of the Federal Court, swears "that, in a suit pending in the Federal Court, White's lessee vs. Cantrel, at the November term, 1822, Mr. Darby filed affidavits for some purpose, in said cause, and that after the affidavit was filed, a deed, supposed to be the one alluded to by Darby, as in the possession of Stephen Barton, was found in the office of N. Ewing, Esq. without any assignment to said Barton. On the production of said deed, in court, witness thought Darby seemed to be much confused, and the suit was then dismissed. Many persons, and indeed nearly all whom witness had heard speak about it, have said that they believed that Darby, in that transaction, committed perjury."

John McNary, Judge of the Federal Court, swears "that in an ejectment case depending in the Federal Circuit Court, T. White's lessor vs. Stephen Cantrel, Patrick H. Darby made an affidavit, in which he stated that he derived his title to the lot in dispute, by a deed from Stephen Barton, to him, a deed or assignment from Samuel Barton to Stephen Barton, and an assignment on the deed from Thomas White to Samuel Barton. This affidavit was made on the 23d November, 1822, as appears by reference to the original affidavit. On the 3d December, 1822, P. H. Darby made another affidavit, in which he stated that he had in his possession the deed from Stephen Barton to himself, which he was willing to exhibit to the court. The deed from Samuel Barton to Thomas White, with the endorsement thereon from said White to S. Barton, and the deed of assignment from Samuel Barton to Stephen Barton, was, as he was informed by Stephen Barton, taken by him to Red River, in the Territory of Arkansas; that said Barton was to bring them to him, but that on his way from Red River to Nashville, said Barton died, the year before, &c. After the production of these affidavits, the counsel for the defendants moved the court for a writ of subpœna duces tecum, directed to the Clerk, directing him to bring into court the deed for the lot from Samuel Barton to Thomas White, which deed was produced in open court, and had none of those assignments or endorsements on it. The Clerk stated to the Judge that the deed had been on file, as he believed, since the year 1787. Soon after this, Darby dismissed his suit."

R Weakly, in his deposition, says: "From my knowledge of Patrick H. Darby, I should not feel myself safe to rely on him, as a man or lawyer, on oath or otherwise, were his own interests at stake."

Hardy M. Cryer, swears: "This deponent answereth, that he has not for many years doubted but that Patrick H. Darby, plaintiff, did forge the name of J. Cryer, my father, in writing, and that, too, after he was dead."

Mr. Cave Johnson, swears: "I have frequently heard the crime of perjury charged to Mr. Darby, as well as the offence of having purloined a will from the records of the Robertson county court, which was believed to be an important paper against him in the trial of a cause in which he was interested in setting aside said will."

H. Frey, swears: "Public sentiment upon the subject of Darby's general character, does not ascribe to him one single virtue."

Frederick W. Huling, swears: "I believe his (Darby's) general character is very bad. I have heard him charged with running and selling for a slave, a free negro woman, under a feigned and fraudulent purchase, brought about by himself; of taking advantage of the confidence of his clients; of swearing falsely; of a want of principle; of stirring up law-suits; of duplicity, &c."

Such, Sir, is the character of Darby; a man whose name was stricken from the roll of attorneys in Tennessee, and who, for his services in defaming Gen. Jackson, is now sustained by Mr. Clay's party in Kentucky!! Do you want to know more of his character? Let me refer you to the able, feeling, and satisfactory vindication of his brother's memory, lately published by Dr. Sharp, and to the deposition of the lady who overheard Darby's threats, before that tragical event. If you can, after their perusal, ask the publication of Darby's slanders against General Jackson, by one who, you admit, was the advocate of truth, *when you knew him*—then, indeed, does the Thomas Speed whom I knew in my youth, differ from the same man under the reign of corruption.

I come now to so much of your letter as relates to the charge of falsehood, made, and so perseveringly preferred, against your old friend.

The editorial article which drew forth your first assault upon me, said: "Mr. Eppes never opened his mouth in the Senate on the subject; the report of Mr. Lacock was never published until the 2d March, two days before the final adjournment, neither was it ever acted on."

In proof and *explanation* of which assertion, the same article said: "On the 9th of March following, some strictures were published on this report, when the National Intelligencer of that date, uses the following: 'The report of the Senate, which we have already laid before our readers, of an import very unfavorable to Gen. Jack-

son, was neither debated nor acted on in the Senate. It is, therefore, a document open to examination—to an examination the more free, because, in the proper place, an opportunity did not occur for making it."

The same editorial article proceeds to say: "On the 20th of March, Mr. Lacock addresses a letter to Gales, in reply, wherein he accuses him of reflecting on the Senate—to which Mr. Gales, in his paper of that date, again replies: 'At a late day in the session, a committee of the Senate made a report, impeaching the conduct and tending to affect the character of General Jackson. That in itself is not a common occurrence, because it has never happened before, since we have had any thing to do with a newspaper. The report referred to, was given to the public through the medium of our columns, *and was not discussed or acted on in the Senate for want of time.*'"

Our declaration was that Mr. Eppes never opened his mouth in the Senate on the subject relative to the charge which we were repelling, and extracts from which were given in the same editorial article; and, in the article to which your last attack purports to be a reply, I said: "The charge made against General Jackson was for an attempt at violence on the person of Mr. Eppes, on the night of the 3d of March. The provocation alleged was, the remarks of Mr. Eppes, in his official duty on that night, at that time."

This, you say, is a falsehood, and deny that the Whig or the Press had made such a charge!!

The editorial article before you, contained the extract from the Whig, in the following words: "At the time the discussion of the Seminolean war was pending in the Senate of the United States, General Jackson, who had gone as far as New York, suddenly returned to Washington. When he came to the Senate, the late John W. Eppes, a Senator from Virginia, was animadverting upon his conduct in the war." The extract then proceeds with the pretended interview between the General and Commodore Decatur.

The extract from the Democratic Press, before you, said: "The last day of the session the Senate have an evening sitting, for the purpose of receiving messages from the President. On this occasion the Commodore conducted Mrs. Decatur to the brick Capitol, to witness the ceremony of the adjournment of the Senate. As they passed through a small anti-room to the door of the Senate chamber, about nine o'clock at night, they saw Gen. Jackson, with his two Aids," &c.

That I was correct, and you in an error, appears fully from a comparison of the extracts which I have made. The Democratic Press fixes the time to be on "*the third of March;*" for, if your new devotion to Mr. Clay has made you forget your obligations to an old friend, and the respect due to yourself, as a gentleman, it is to be hoped that you have not now to learn that "the third of March" and "the last day of the session," are synonymous terms, when applied to the close of the sittings of each Congress. So much, then, for your charge of falsehood, in relation to this subject. The proofs of Gen. Jackson's innocence are so strong that you and Darby are, so far as I can learn, the only partisans of Mr. Clay who insist upon his guilt.

We are often at a loss to account for the singular fatuity which beclouds the understandings of some men. What are the secret influences which have led you to forget your obligations to me? If your object was to court the favor of Mr. Clay; if you expected him to reward you as a volunteer in his cause, you will be disappointed; for, whilst in your unprovoked attack upon an old friend, you prove yourself capable of performing any work, which Mr. Clay in his extremity may assign you, you have cut off all hopes of reward from him, by sapping the foundation upon which your co-workers have built their attacks upon me.

You express your surprise that I, who, you say, was in my youth, when you knew me, the advocate of truth, should now support a party who have declared their intention to put down the Administration though it be as pure as the angels.

It has been the purpose of the Coalition whom you aspire to serve, to charge that I was without character or principle, and placed here to conduct a press, the property of others. By admitting that, when you knew me, I was the advocate of truth, you unwittingly bear witness to my former good character, and thus offend, past forgiveness, those whom you most desire to please. How far the character of the party whom it is my pride to support, justifies the inference you draw, that I have abandoned that love of truth for which you give me credit, is a question which I willingly submit to a candid public. Whilst such men as Jackson and Calhoun, and those who compose the present majority in Congress and of the nation, shall approve, it will give no uneasiness that you disapprove.

But the sentiment which you here ascribe to the distinguished and patriotic Senator from your own State, is not the sentiment expressed by him: nor is it the sentiment of the party with which he acts.

You must know that your charge rests on no other authority than the word of *one* of the Editors of the National Intelligencer, uttered in the moment of great excitement and malignant resentment, produced by the vote of Col. Johnson on the subject of printer to the Senate; whilst it is contradicted by the express declaration of Col. Johnson and his whole course as a member of the Senate. Do you believe the statement of Mr. Seaton? Can you believe that Col. Johnson made such a declaration? Do you believe that Mr. Seaton would have ever published such a declaration, if Col. Johnson had voted for him to be printer to the Senate? If you do, how do you account for the fact, which he himself admits, that the secret was carefully locked up in his bosom for something like two years, and never found its way into the Intelligencer until the printing of the Senate was given to another in preference to the Editors of that paper? No, Sir, the sentiment attributed to Col. Johnson was inconsistent in itself. It is first attempted to make him admit that the present administration is as pure as the angels in Heaven, and then charges him with a determination to oppose it. Whereas, the statement expressed by him was, that the taint of original sin, the violation of the public will committed in the election of Mr. Adams, ought to prevent his re-election, let him adopt his measures as he might, with a view to please the public. Is this not proper?

If it be true that Mr. Adams was elected in violation of the public will; if Mr. Clay voted for Mr. Adams because he had an understanding, that Mr. Adams, if elected, would appoint him Secretary of State; and, if it be true, that Mr. Adams appointed Mr. Clay his Secretary of State under such understanding; then, I contend, that it is not only the privilege, but the duty of every good citizen to oppose the re-election of Mr. Adams.

Mr. Clay, in his address to the public, dated Lexington, 29th June, 1827, says, that "I neither made, nor authorized, nor 'knew of any proposition whatever to either of the three candidates who were returned to the House of Representatives at the last Presidential election, or to the friends of either of them, for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, or for any other purpose; and all allegations, intimations, and innuendoes, that my vote on that occasion was offered to be given in consideration of any stipulation or understanding, express or implied, direct or indirect, written or verbal, that I was, or that any other person was not to be appointed Secretary of State, or that I was in any way to be personally benefited, are devoid of all truth, and destitute of any foundation whatsoever.'"

Mr. Clay, in the same address declares, "that he was charged with the highest offence, of which a representative of the people could be guilty, and asserts, that, in the event of the truth of these charges, there is no punishment which would exceed the measure of his offence."

And shall Mr. Clay be permitted to avoid the just sentence which he here pronounces? I believe him guilty, and it is my duty to oppose him.

The use you have attempted to make of the declaration of the patriotic Senator, alluded to and misstated by you, is contradicted by his course in the Senate. That you, in the face of his votes in their support, should charge him and his party with a determination to oppose, "right or wrong," the *measures* of the administration, is in accordance with the policy of *your* party—who affect to consider that all who desire the re-election of Mr. Adams, must necessarily support his measures, and that those who support his measures are bound, consequently, to support his re-election. Such a policy would continue Mr. Adams in office for ever, and establish his father's doctrine of a President and Senate for life.

Your attack upon Col. Johnson developes, in part, the source of your attack upon me. Although he has given to the Administration a fair and candid support, he is not its partisan. He cannot be moulded by Mr. Clay's will to the support of Mr. C.'s future plans of "safe precedents," and it is resolved to remove him from the Senate. Since you have disposed of your clerkship, a seat in the Senate would, no doubt, be very acceptable, and the hard times, I fear, must press heavily indeed, when you are driven to seek for promotion by the voluntary abuse of an old friend, and a voluntary association with Patrick H. Darby.

To the people of Kentucky I need not speak of the services which Col. Johnson has rendered in the Senate and in the field. Who that knows his worth, (and who is there that cannot bear testimony to some act of valor, of duty, or of kindness? I say, who is there that knows his worth and his services, that will not place a proper estimate upon your attempt to traduce him? The National Intelligencer, the polluted source from whence you have drawn your slander, since I commenced writing out this article, has done him the justice to publish an article, in which honorable mention is made of his firmness and services; and the honorable Secretary of War, (one of your favorite administration,) has, *on a former occasion*, spoken of him in terms which, if true, and we venture to affirm that Mr. Barbour will not retract a single expression, place Col. Johnson beyond the reach of your calumny. I know not the motive which operates on your cotemporaries of the National Intelligencer. "The Signs of the Times" may have given them warning that the "present President" and his Secretary of State will not dispense the "Treasury pap" after the fourth of March next, and this compliment to Col. Johnson may be an anchor, cast to the windward, by some experienced political calculators who never have opposed, and we venture to predict never will oppose, any existing administration, until they find one too honest and independent to *purchase* their support. Let their motives be what they may, I have taken the liberty to re-print the speech of Mr. Secretary Barbour, which I advise you to peruse.

You conclude your address to me by insinuating that my support of Gen. Jackson is not disinterested. You admit that my support of yourself was disinterested. The fact that, when, in order to counteract the machinations of those very men with whom you are now associated, it became necessary to employ the press and publish handbills, I paid out of my own pocket, the expense of those publications, which, for me, at that time of life, was a large sum, should have spared me the insinuation which you here make.

In purchasing this press and removing to this place I was not unmindful of my obligations to a young and increasing family, nor of the duty which every honorable man owes to himself. I saw plainly that a press at this place conducted upon such principles as the crisis and the public interest demanded, would be supported by THE PEOPLE. I did believe that the Telegraph would amply repay me for the risk and labor which I was about to encounter, and I have not been disappointed.

About seventeen thousand subscribers have been added to the list of its patrons, and I have the gratification to know that this support has been given to this paper because the people believe it to be devoted to their best interests; and from a disposition on their part to reward with their confidence and patronage, one who, although he has breasted the multiplied calumnies of the Coalition, has never, in one instance, sacrificed his independence, or *meanly* sought pecuniary aid even from his political friends.

With a view to injure the influence of this press it has been lately circulated in the Administration presses, that the Telegraph is the property of a company known to Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Van Buren, and that the printing of the Senate was given to me to lessen the expenses of the establishment. The National Journal has directly charged that the paper is the property of Major

Eaton. Justice to the Senate and to myself seems to require that this slander should be put to rest. I give to it the lie direct, and refer you to the affidavit of Mr. John S. Meehan, the gentleman from whom I purchased it, as the complete refutation of every slander upon this point.

I have already swelled this letter much beyond the length originally intended, and conclude by saying that it has been my misfortune to differ with some of my old personal friends and political associates, but by none of them have I been so wantonly and unjustifiably assailed as by yourself. DUFF GREEN.

Whereas it has been charged that the United States' Telegraph was the property of members of Congress—I hereby state, that that paper was established by me, on my own account, and was my sole property; and that, when I sold the same to Gen. D. Green, he became the sole proprietor, and I have continued in the office as an assistant, on a salary. Our intercourse on all matters relating to the establishment has been full and confidential: and I am well assured that he continued to be its sole proprietor until Mr. Jarvis became his partner. I therefore do not hesitate to declare, that the statement that any member of Congress, or that any other person, except myself, in the first instance, and Gen. Green, and Mr. Jarvis, subsequently, ever had a proprietory interest in the United States' Telegraph, is utterly untrue.

JOHN S. MEEHAN.

Sworn to by the subscriber, John S. Meehan, before me, a justice of the peace, for the county of Washington, in the District of Columbia, on the 9th May, 1828.

CHARLES H. W. WHARTON.

Remarks of Mr. Barbour in the Senate of the United States, March 31st, 1818, on introducing the proposition for causing a sword to be presented to Col. R. M. Johnson.

Mr. BARBOUR said, in availing himself of the notice given on yesterday, of asking leave to introduce a resolution, whose object would be to present to Col. Richard M. Johnson some testimonial of the high sense entertained by the nation of the distinguished services rendered by him on the 5th of October, 1813, in the battle of the Thames, he considered himself bound to make a few remarks, disclosing the propriety of granting the leave asked.

As to the distinguished merit of Col. Johnson, he presumed there could be no difference of opinion: the only objection that could possibly present itself, would be the time when the resolution was presented, or possibly, the grade which Col. Johnson held in the army. To remove these, if they exist, was all that devolved on him. As to the objection of time, it will at once be removed by reflecting on that which has just occurred: the vote of thanks which has been awarded in favor of General Harrison and Governor Shelby. It is unknown that rumor, the result of envy, or some other bad passion, had attempted to throw a shade around the character of that distinguished commander. He felt as he ought, and sought an investigation to vindicate his character from the foul aspersions which had been cast upon it. It, after some delay, took place, and resulted in an honorable acquittal. In the mean time, the venerable Shelby was, at his own request, withheld from the notice of the nation, as it regarded the distinguished services he had rendered. Shelby, a name which can never be mentioned without awakening, in every American bosom, emotions of gratitude. I see in this illustrious character a display of that love of country and chivalrous spirit which conceived and effected our independence, and, unabated by age, it reappeared to vindicate those rights, to the establishment of which, in his more youthful days, he had so essentially contributed; but, he is as generous as he is brave, and he refused to accept a tribute of respect, whose indirect consequence might have been a reflection on the Commander-in-Chief, to whose zeal, patriotism, and capacity in conducting this campaign, he always bore a cheerful testimony. Col. Johnson, influenced by the same sensibility, peremptorily refused to his friends the permission of bringing this subject before the representatives of the people. I, however, will barely remark, in regard to the Commanding General, that, with the regrets which the delay of justice to this citizen must necessarily create, will be mingled some consolation in the reflection, that his character has been entirely purified from the censure which had been improperly cast upon it; and that the meed now dispensed, has the sanction of the deliberate judgment of the nation, unbiassed by passion, or the false fire of the moment. He will now receive it with a grateful feeling, as the highest reward which freemen can give or a freeman receive.

With regard to Col. Johnson, it is due to him to say, this proposition is now made without his consent. Mr. B., however, who took a pride in calling him his friend, took the responsibility upon himself, because he thought it would be an act of consummate injustice, were no lasting memorial to be erected to the valor which he so signally displayed on the occasion alluded to. Another motive with Mr. B. was, a notification on the part of Col. Johnson, of his retiring from public life. While he regretted this event as a serious loss to the public councils, he was perfectly satisfied that his reasons were sufficient to justify it. While upon this subject he would barely add, that he was satisfied it would not be deemed an exaggeration, when he asserted, that no man in Congress had performed more service than Col. Johnson. In addition to the just claims of his own particular constituents upon him, what part of the Union is it from which applications have not been made, and cheerfully attended to, by this patriotic citizen? So much for the first objection that might possibly be made, although he did not anticipate it. As to the second difficulty that might exist in the opinion of some gentlemen, the grade of Col. Johnson. If there were no precedent applicable to this case, Mr. B. would have had no difficulty in fixing one. It is the attribute of all governments to adapt their proceedings to the endless vicissitudes which human affairs continually present. The valor displayed by Col. Johnson is unsurpassed by any example in the annals of mankind. But it is not now necessary to press this question, because you have a precedent in the case of

M'Donough and his associates, in the distinguished victory gained by them on Lake Champlain, over a British squadron and some others. Mr. B. said, he should but ill represent the feelings of his friend, or his own, if, in asking for this tribute of respect, any thing could be inferred, from what is said or done, unfavorable to those patriotic officers holding grades between Col. Johnson and the Commander-in-Chief. It was but justice to them to say, that, had it been their good fortune on the day of battle to have had the post of honor, they would have acquired those laurels so dearly earned by Col. Johnson. Generous as brave, so far from looking with an eye of envy upon this honorable tribute of gratitude, dispensed in behalf of this distinguished citizen, they will warmly participate in the fine feelings with which Col. Johnson will receive this mark of his country's distinction.

As to the merit of Col. Johnson to this evidence of our gratitude, Mr. B. said, he had already declared that, upon this point, there could be no difference of opinion. To expatiate upon it would be unnecessary; yet, he could not dismiss this subject with briefly enumerating some of the leading acts of his public life, so far at least as they connect themselves with the question under consideration.

Let it then be remembered, that he was zealously in favor of the war. Not content with the distinguished place he held in the councils of the nation, he patriotically resolved to vindicate with his own arm those rights which he had so manfully asserted while voting for the declaration of war. He erects his standard, and proclaims his purpose; and although much was to be expected from the patriotism, the zeal, the enterprise, and courage of Kentucky—a people Mr. B. delighted to honor, as, in addition to their merit, he considered them his own kindred, thousands of his near and highly respected relations being there; although he said much was to have been expected, yet, when we reflect upon the devotedness of those old and young, rich and poor, rallying around the standard of their country, we see a new subject of admiration.

In doing justice to those patriots, let it not be understood, that any invidious distinction is intended to be made in their favour. Mr. B. said, he well knew that illustrious examples of courage and patriotism were exhibited in other portions of the Union, and on all proper occasions, he was prepared to lift his feeble voice to do them ample justice. But to return to the patriotic volunteers, who embodied at the call of Col. Johnson, displaying a spectacle as honorable to themselves as to Col. Johnson, manifesting the high confidence they reposed in this, their illustrious citizen. These brave men, leaving their homes and their domestic blessings, and weighing the honor of their country and the defence of her rights, against the privations and hazards of war, willingly accepted them as an equivalent. Undeterred by the difficulties or the dangers to which they are about to be exposed, they fearlessly commit themselves to the trackless desert, to the secret danger of the ambuscaded savage, or the more open perils of their less savage ally. A night of misfortune had shed its disastrous gloom over our affairs. It was given to Com. Perry to turn back the tide of adversity upon the fountain from which it flowed. Lake Erie was reserved for the display of the brilliant superiority of American bravery and seamanship, over our then haughty foe; achieving a victory which, in the language of President Madison, will fill an early page in our naval annals, as having never been surpassed in lustre, however much it may have been in magnitude. The way having been opened, the commanding general and his veteran associate, with promptitude availed themselves of the opportunity thus offered, to throw themselves into the enemy's country, and pursuing, with unanimity and unexampled rapidity, (of which pursuit Col. Johnson led the van) speedily overtook them. The battle is arrayed: the post of honor, for such he made it, is assigned to Colonel Johnson. The enemy have the Thames on the left; a British regiment, seven hundred strong, has also a ravine on the right, beyond which was the celebrated Tecumseh, at the head of fifteen hundred savages: a force truly formidable. When we refer to the commander, of whom it may be said, unless his character has been greatly exaggerated, that had he been favored with the embellishments of civilized life, and the benefits of military experience, he would have been one of the most distinguished captains of the present eventful period; to which, when we superadd that his associates were acting under the impression of their being under the particular favor of Heaven, it may well be said, that the force thus to be encountered was indeed formidable. This force, so placed, and so formidable to ordinary minds, presented nothing alarming to the mounted regiment. Col Johnson divides his regiment, say one thousand strong—one battalion placed under the command of Col. James Johnson, who gave, in accepting his station under a younger brother, an honorable evidence of his patriotism; the other battalion, headed by himself, passed a defile and placed itself on the right of a marsh. The bugle was to announce the readiness for attack The sound is heard, and, mingled with the watchword, victory or death, floated along the line. The British force was overwhelmed in an instant; they threw down their arms, and on their knees supplicated mercy.—Although there was a long account of unatoned for blood, impiously shed by this united British and Indian force, and retaliation justified even to their entire extermination, yet, at the cry of mercy, the sword was immediately sheathed, and the guilty survived. Far different was the conduct with the savage foe. There man was opposed to man, in single combat, rifle to rifle, and tomahawk to tomahawk; wounds and death were mutually dealt out. Colonel Johnson, early in the combat, received two severe wounds, attended with the loss of much blood. In this trying crisis, an ordinary courage would have retired from the combat; on him it had a different effect. It seemed to impart to him new courage, which manifested itself in a prodigy of valor, which loses nothing in a comparison with the most splendid achievement recorded in the whole extent of "backward times." Calling around him twenty spirits, the bravest among the brave, he resolved, at their head, to precipitate himself on the fiercest part of the conflict, where Tecumseh in person commanded, and who was the soul of the battle. Of the daring spirits, composing the forlorn hope, one

only escaped. The others were all cut down, some to rise no more; the remainder, mangled by numerous wounds, of which the subject of the present resolution had his melancholy share.

Bleeding, exhausted by effusion of blood, and alone, his fate seemed inevitable, when Tecumseh, cool and collected, approached with his unerring rifle and ruthless tomahawk. It pleased Providence to interpose. Amidst universal carnage, and in the teeth of approaching death, Col. Johnson remained undismayed, and hurled at Tecumseh that death which had been prepared for him. This is the man and the services to which Mr. B. wished an honorable testimony to be erected, one more lasting than that which is found in evanescent papers of the day. If any thing was necessary to be added in support of the high claims of this distinguished citizen, upon the gratitude of his country, it would be found in the honorable notice taken of him by the commanding general, and repeated in the most flattering manner by President Madison, in communicating the result of the battle to Congress. But it is more than unnecessary to furnish any additional proofs.—Wherever there is an American, the courage and services of Col. Johnson, are known and applauded. Mr. B. indulged a hope, bordering on confidence, that the resolution would receive the unanimous consent of the Senate, for in that unanimity its principal merit would consist.

Mr. Barbour then submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be requested to present to Col. Richard M. Johnson, a sword, as a testimony of the high sense entertained by Congress, of the daring and distinguished valor displayed by himself and the regiment of volunteers under his command, in charging and essentially contributing to vanquish the combined British and Indian forces under Major General Proctor, on the Thames, in Upper Canada, on the 5th October, 1813.

The resolution passed the Senate unanimously, and the House of Representatives, nem. con.

COMMUNICATION.

GENTLEMEN: Very incorrect calculations are made, and imposed on the public credulity for want of such a statement before them as the following, which shows, incontrovertibly, that Mr. Adams cannot be re-elected, if you give to him, as I have done in the following statement, every doubtful vote in the nation; whereas, I do verily believe, that, out of the 86 votes set down as *doubtful*, and as such placed to the list of Mr. Adams, General Andrew Jackson will receive at least 54, which added to the 135 *certain*, will give him 189 votes, and leave Mr. Adams but 72 votes; which will be found, on counting the returns to Congress to be about his vote, and all he will get, notwithstanding the coalition formed, and all the desperate means used, and to be used, between this and the election. I think it well to give this statement to the community, as it is calculated to convince every well judging mind that Mr. Adams has no chance of a re-election, although he may get not only Kentucky, but all the other doubtful States.

The Kentucky election for Governor comes on in August: if, perchance, the administration candidate shall be elected, this statement is calculated to prevent the idea being entertained, that the election can still possibly be in favor of Mr. Adams; whereas, if it goes against him, it makes a difference of 28 from his poll, and thereby constitutes 14 of the 54 doubtful votes that the writer believes General Jackson will get, although, as shown, if it goes against Jackson, it cannot prevent his election.

	Adams.	Doubtful.	Jackson.
Maine,		9	
New Hampshire,		8	
Massachusetts,	15		
Rhode Island,	4		
Connecticut,	8		
Vermont,		7	
New York,	10	6	20
New Jersey,		8	
Pennsylvania,			28
Delaware,		3	
Maryland,	3	2	6
Virginia,			24
North Carolina,			15
South Carolina,			11
Georgia,			9
Kentucky,		14	
Tennessee,			11
Ohio,		16	
Louisiana,		5	
Indiana,		5	
Mississippi,			3
Illinois,			3
Alabama,			5
Missouri,		3	
	40	86	135

Remarks by the Editors of the United States' Telegraph.

The information obtained by an extensive correspondence and a close attention to public sentiment, satisfies us that the calculation of our correspondent falls far short of the vote which will be given to General Jackson.

The late election in New Hampshire has had the effect to unite the republican party of that State, and many changes have taken place favorable to General Jackson. Among those who have admitted that General Jackson is the republican candidate, and have declared their intention to support him on that account, is the late Speaker of the House of Representatives of that State. We no longer consider New Hampshire as a doubtful State.

In Maine, the vote is by Districts. Our particular information does not extend to the *whole*, but we have assurances on which we can rely, that General Jackson will receive *three* votes in Maine.

Our correspondent gives to Mr. Adams 10 votes in New York, and puts down 6 votes as doubtful. We are not willing to admit that Mr. Adams will *certainly* receive a single vote in New York. For some time past we have supposed that the Morgan excitement might render some six or perhaps ten of the western votes doubtful, but the late elections evince great changes. In towns where the General's friends were last fall in very small minorities, they now

have large majorities, and we candidly believe, that we yield too much when we admit 6 doubtful votes for Mr. Adams in New York.

In Maryland, our correspondent allows Mr. Adams 3 votes certain and 2 doubtful; we are not willing to allow him a single certain vote in Maryland. We think that 2 votes are doubtful, and perhaps the vote in Clem. Dorsey's district may be certain for Mr. Adams; but late accounts from St. Mary's induce the hope that great changes, favorable to the cause of truth and the people, will take place even there.

New Jersey is put down doubtful. This is wrong. We have, in this State, six hundred and eighty-five subscribers, and an extensive correspondence. The friends of General Jackson are active, and almost every day brings us new proof of his increasing popularity in that State. We cannot admit that New Jersey is doubtful.

In Delaware, the friends of General Jackson are sanguine of success. It is true, that the member elected last year, is friendly to the coalition. His election, although, in truth, no proof of the popularity of Mr. Adams, was the result of a peculiar combination of circumstances which it is unnecessary here to explain. Set it down doubtful.

Passing to the west, Louisiana, as well as Indiana, Missouri, Kentucky, and Ohio, are put down as doubtful States. Until lately, we have entertained some fears that Mr. Livingston, the able and patriotic representative of the District of New Orleans would not be re-elected. Late accounts from the City of New Orleans, the seat of the strength of the coalition, induce a belief that he will be re-elected, and assure us of the vote of that State; but we know less of public sentiment in Louisiana than in any of the other States, and without believing it to be doubtful, for want of information, we set this down as such.

We do not believe that the vote of Kentucky or Ohio is doubtful. The contest in Kentucky at the August election will be violent. If Major Barry should be elected Governor, it will be taken as conclusive evidence of the strength of General Jackson. He is an amiable, highly talented, and patriotic man, but he was the chief justice of the new court party—now the minority in State politics.

It is true that Mr. Metcalfe was of the same party, but it was part of the policy of Mr. Clay's partisans to abuse Mr. Barry. A strong prejudice has been excited against him, and it is not believed that his vote in August will equal that of General Jackson in October, yet very little doubt is entertained of his election; but put down Kentucky as doubtful.

All our accounts from Missouri concur in assuring us of the vote of that State. Mr. Bates, the present representative, is the bitter personal enemy of Col. Benton. He opposed Mr. Clay with great violence, and such is his hostility to Mr. Benton, that he would find great difficulty in supporting any candidate of whom Mr. Benton was a supporter. There are now two candidates in opposition to Mr. Bates, and a third spoken of. Mr. B. has, from the force of circumstances, acquired a personal popularity, that may, under such circumstances, secure a re-election; but the vote of Missouri cannot, with propriety, be put down doubtful.

We do not believe that Ohio or Indiana is doubtful: nor can we consent to place Illinois with the doubtful States.

The calculation upon which we place reliance is—

	Jackson.	Adams.	Doubtful.
Maine,	3		6
New Hampshire,	8		
Massachusetts,		15	
Rhode Island,		4	
Connecticut,		8	
Vermont,		7	
New York,	30		6
New Jersey,	8		
Pennsylvania,	28		
Delaware,	3		
Maryland,	9		2
Virginia,	24		
North Carolina,	15		
South Carolina,	11		
Georgia,	9		
Kentucky,	14		
Tennessee,	11		
Ohio,	16		
Louisiana,	5		
Indiana,	5		
Mississippi,	3		
Illinois,	3		
Alabama,	5		
Missouri,	3		
	213	34	14

In making this estimate, we are influenced by that strict regard for truth which has marked all our statements; and we appeal to the history of the past two years, and defy our bitterest political opponents to point to a single instance in which we have, intentionally, misstated public sentiment. Almost every prediction which we have made has been fulfilled to the letter. Our confidence that the calculations here presented will be verified, is strong and unequivocal.

But admit, for the sake of argument, that the 3 votes of Delaware, the 3 additional votes of Maryland, the 14 votes of Kentucky, and the 16 votes of Ohio, with the 5 votes of Louisiana, *and all the doubtful votes*, ought to be added to the 34 certain votes allotted to Mr. Adams, and all will make an aggregate of but 89 votes; leaving a deficiency of 42 votes to be supplied; whilst all these votes deducted from the 213 allotted to General Jackson, leave him one hundred and seventy-two votes—forty-one more than a majority of the whole.

Our readers will receive with this Nos. 10, 11, and 12, which, if the regular order of publication is adopted, will suspend the issue of the Extra until the 12th of June. Our first object has been to serve the public: all that we have asked is the means of defraying the expense. If those who now are indebted to us yield to our just demand upon them, our resources will be ample. It is hoped that the subscribers to our weekly and tri-weekly paper, to whom these four numbers will be sent *without charge*, will feel that an additional obligation is imposed on them to make prompt remittances by mail, which, in all cases, may be done at our risk.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH...Extra.

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published, weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*, subject to newspaper postage, and no more.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, JUNE 21, 1828. No. 15.

STATEMENT of the sums remitted to Europe for the service of the Department of State, between the 7th of October and the last day of December, of the year 1824, *and the sums remitted to Europe for the service of that Department, between the same dates in the year* 1827; *showing, in each case, the periods when the bills remitted became payable.*

DATE OF THE REGISTRY OF THE BILLS.	TO WHAT PLACE.	WHEN PAYABLE.	POUNDS STERLING.	GUILDERS.	DOLLARS.
1824.					
October 7	* London	60 days after sight	1,600 00 00	- -	7,786 66
23	† Amsterdam	ditto	- - -	20,000	10,250 00
23	† ditto	ditto	- - -	5,000	
23	* London	ditto	1,400 00 00		
23	* ditto	ditto	679 5 00		
23	* ditto	15 days after sight	295 15 00	- -	16,650 00
23	* ditto	60 days after sight	1,000 00 00		
December 1	† ditto	ditto	4,109 11 9½	- -	20,000 00
					54,686 66
1827.					
December 17	London	60 days after sight	807 3 6	- -	4,000 00
17	ditto	ditto	1,008 19 4	- -	5,000 00
17	ditto	ditto	5,044 16 10	- -	25,000 00
17	ditto	ditto	1,008 19 4	- -	5,000 00
					39,000 00

* Credited by Bankers in 1824.
† Credited by Bankers in 1828.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, REGISTER'S OFFICE, *May* 10, 1828.

JOSEPH NOURSE.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Register's Office, May 10, 1828.

SIR: I have the honor to state, in reply to your letter of the 9th instant, that, of the $70,000 of remittances, contained in the statement of the Chief Clerk of this Department, the sum of $39,000 only is contained in the statement of expenditures, as prepared at this office on the 5th March last, and that the balance of $31,000 is a charge on the appropriations of that Department for the year 1828. I transmit, herewith, "a statement of the sums remitted to Europe for the service of the Department of State, between the 7th day of October, and the last day of December, of the year 1824, and the sums remitted to Europe for the services of that Department, between the same dates, in the year 1827, showing, in each case, the periods when the bills remitted became payable. I am, Sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

JOSEPH NOURSE, *Register.*

HON. JAMES HAMILTON.

No. 8.

STATEMENT of the sums of money which have been disbursed through the State Department, and settled at the Treasury upon the certificate of the President without specification, since the first day of July, 1790, specifying the sum paid in each year: furnished in compliance with a letter of the Chairman of the Committee on Retrenchment, of the 13th of February, 1828.

On the 16th September, 1812,	$14,000 00
From the 29th November, 1812, to the 10th March, 1813,	51,652 56
In the year 1813,	11,693 74
1815,	150 00
1817,	700 00
In the year 1820,	400 00
1823,	3,000 00
1824,	2,130 32
1825,	1,700 00
1826,	1,666 66
1827,	8,958 01
	$96,051 29

Payments of a similar nature to the foregoing were made under the act of the 1st of July, 1790, and subsequent acts; but from the destruction of accounts and vouchers by the conflagration of 1814, the Treasury do not possess the means of ascertaining the amounts expended with any precision. In the printed public accounts for the year 1794, however, the sum of $1,500 appears to have been advanced to Edmund Randolph, Secretary of State, on account of the "contingent charges of Government," pursuant to instructions of the President of the United States; and also, in the same accounts for 1796, the sum of $3,000 appears to have been advanced to Timothy Pickering, Secretary of State, "to defray the contingent charges of Government."

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Register's Office, February 28, 1828.

JOSEPH NOURSE, *Register.*

(No. 9.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington 26th March, 1828.

SIR: I have received your letter of the 24th instant, containing a copy of a resolution adopted by the Committee on Retrenchment, in which they are pleased to inquire—Did John H. Pleasants go as bearer of despatches from the United States to Rio Janeiro and Buenos Ayres, in 1825? Did he deliver the despatches to the proper authority at Rio Janeiro and Buenos Ayres? If he did not go, what became of the despatches? Who bore them to the Government of Rio Janeiro and Buenos Ayres? Where did J. H. Pleasants go after he left the United States? Was it not known to the Department, when his account was settled and paid him, that he had not been to Rio Janeiro or Buenos Ayres, as bearer of despatches from this Government?

In reply, I have the honor to state, for the information of the Committee, that Mr. Pleasants was engaged in the spring of 1825 to carry to our respective Charges des Affaires at the Brazils and Buenos Ayres, their credentials, commissions, and general instructions, and other despatches from this Department; that, with that view he left the city of Richmond, the place of his residence, on the 19th day of April, and embarked at the port of New-York, on the 28th day of May, 1825, on board the brig William Tell, having employed the intermediate time in seeking, from Baltimore to Boston, a vessel in which he could obtain a passage: that, whilst at sea, he was taken so ill as to be apprehensive of his life, which he supposed would be in imminent danger if he continued the voyage, and meeting a vessel at sea bound to Antwerp, he transferred himself to her, and committed the despatches with which he was charged to the care of Captain Hinman, the master of the vessel William Tell: that the despatches, both for Mr. Forbes, our Charge d'Affairs at Buenos Ayres, and for Mr. Raguet, our Charge d'Affaires at Rio Janeiro, were delivered by the Captain of the William Tell to the former gentleman on the 12th day of August, 1825, as will appear by an extract from a despatch from him under date the 15th day of September, 1825, marked A, and that those intended for Mr. Raguet were received by him on the 26th October, 1825, as will appear by an extract from a despatch from him, under date the 12th of November, 1825, which is marked B.

I beg leave also to refer to a copy of a letter from Mr. Pleasants, under date the 7th day of July, 1825, marked C, and to an extract from a letter from him, under date the 22d Oct. 1825, marked D, as explaining more fully the motives which induced him to change his destination, and to commit the public despatches in his care to Captain Hinman. During his voyage in the Antwerp vessel, Mr. Pleasants met at sea a vessel bound to Liverpool, to which he transferred himself, and he arrived in that port on the first day of July, 1825. He reached the port of New York, on his return to the United States, on the 22d October, 1825, bringing with him despatches for this Department from Mr. R. King, our Minister at the Court of London.

It was known at this Department, when the account of Mr. Pleasants was settled and closed, that he had not reached Rio de Janeiro or Bue-

nos Ayres; but it was also known that the despatches which had been intrusted to him, had been received by the persons to whom they were respectively addressed; and it was believed that he had been prevented from personally delivering them by the causes already stated. Supposing the affliction of disease did not occasion a forfeiture of all claim for expenses, and all compensation for services, the allowances made to him were according to established usage, which has prevailed as far back as any traces of the accounts of bearers of despatches can be discerned in the Treasury. Agreeably to that usage they are generally allowed their expenses, personal and travelling, to the port of embarkation, their passage money at sea, their expenses, personal and travelling, from the port of debarkation to the places of their destination, and the like expenses and passage money on their return home; and they receive, moreover, a compensation for their services of six dollars per day, out of which they defray their expenses whilst they remain at the places to which they are sent, or may stay at Washington for despatches.

Upon an examination of Mr. Pleasants' account, it will be seen that it has been adjusted according to these principles; and, of the sum received by him, $756 was for per diem allowance, and the residue on account of expenses and passage money.

It was not believed that the visitation of Providence with which he was afflicted, ought to deprive him of all allowance for expenses and all compensation for services; but it was not thought right that the per diem should be continued during the whole period of his absence from home, and until his return to New-York, on the 22d October, 1825. It was therefore limited to the 22d August, 1825, that being the time when it was estimated he might have returned to the United States, if, after abandoning the voyage to South America, he had sought an opportunity of coming home, instead of proceeding to Europe. It was within the discretion of the Department to have compensated him as the bearer of dispatches from Mr. King; but it was not deemed proper to make him any allowance for that service.

I have the honor to be, with great respect,
Your obedient servant,

H. CLAY.

The Hon. JAMES HAMILTON, Jr.
Chairman of the Committee of
H. R. on Retrenchment.

(A.)

Extracts of a letter from Mr. Forbes to Mr. Clay, dated Buenos Ayres, 15th September, 1825.

"On the 12th August, I received from Captain Hinman, of brig 'William Tell,' my commission as Charge d'Affaires, together with the instructions your were pleased to send me, and some accompanying letters."

"You will long since have learned from Mr. Pleasants, the gentleman charged with your despatches, his abandonment of his voyage, and return to the United States, by which I lost, to my regret, the pleasure of his acquaintance, and of paying due respect to your recommendation."

(B.)

Extract of a letter from Mr. Raguet, to Mr. Clay, dated Rio de Janeiro, November 12, 1825.

"On the evening of the 23d ultimo, I received from Mr. Forbes, at Buenos Ayres, letters dated on the 16th and 31st August, informing me of the arrival at that port, on the 10th of that month, of a trunk, containing my credentials, with a number of books and other articles, which had been shipped at New-York, regretting the delay to which it had been subjected, whilst in his charge, owing to the want of opportunity, and finally advising me of its having been embarked on board the Swedish brig Pallas—the vessel which conveyed the said letter, and which entered this harbor on the 3d day preceding.

"On the following morning, I called upon the acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, informed him of the fact, and requested permission to land the trunk, and to pass it through the custom house, without the necessity of its being opened. This he cheerfully promised to grant; but a delay occurring in the Treasury Department, the order was not issued until the 26th, when I received the trunk unopened, containing the several despatches from your Department—No. 1, 2, 3, and 4, of 14th, 13th, 16th, April last, respectively, together with all the books, papers, and documents, therein enumerated, *excepting* the 24th "Volume of Niles' Register," which Mr. Forbes ascertained to be deficient at Buenos Ayres. I have no doubt that Mr. Forbes used all due diligence in forwarding this package; and I have ascertained from Captain Martin of the Jasseur, that when he offered to bring it, he was not certain of a destination direct for Rio de Janeiro, which was the cause of the preference being given to the other vessel."

(C.)

Mr. Plesants to Mr. Clay.

LIVERPOOL, *7th July*, 1825.

MY DEAR SIR: If you are surprised at the date of my letter, I am scarcely less surprised at the circumstances myself. To be in England at all is what I never expected. To be here when I expected to have been in Buenos Ayres, seems rather the effect of enchantment, than of ordinary causation. It remains, Sir, for me to account for this apparent dereliction of duty; and I cannot but hope that a plain statement of the circumstances which changed my destination, will exculpate me from any blame in your eyes—so solicitous, as I am, to preserve that good opinion which procured for me the charge conferred by the Department of State.

After many ineffectual attempts to secure an earlier passage, in which I was baffled by the diminished intercourse between the United States and the provinces of South America, which lie beyond the Spanish Main, I succeeded in procuring a passage in the brig William Tell, which sailed from New York on the 28th of May, for the River Plate. This vessel was not such a one as I should have selected, had I had my choice. Being simply a merchant ship, it was destitute of comfortable accommodations; nevertheless, becoming impatient for action, and forseeing that, if I neglected that opportunity, I might meet with no other, I availed myself of it, and sailed, as stated, on the 28th May. I speedly had cause to regret my precipitation in choosing such a ship.

The cabin, not 15 feet square, was destined to accommodate, in a voyage which would occupy from 60 to 90 days, 25 passengers. The quantity of these individuals was, in no respect, * * * * * by their respective qualities; they were, for the most part mechanics, emigrating to that country, and the filth of their persons, and obstreperous * * * of their deportment, was by no means corresponding to the republican respectability of their profession. When the horrors of sea-sickness were superadded to the other painful circumstances attending my situation, my sufferings became greater than I can describe. Deprived of every comfort, with not ten feet square for exercise, a pestilential air, and most offensive smell, pervading every part of the ship, and even without the most common medicines, I assure you, Sir, that death would have been no unwelcome visiter. I was seized with a high fever, and in ten days reduced, in my own opinion, and in that of those around me, to the brink of the grave. At this time, we spoke an American ship from New York, bound to Antwerp: the captain, who was likewise ill, was bearing for Fayal, in the Azores, and, by great persuasion, was induced to take me on board, in a miserable conditions Two days after this removal, my new captain recovered his indispesion, and resumed his course for Antwerp. Having no inclination to visit Holland, I determined to avail myself of the next ship that we might speak, and return to the United States, or go to England. From the time that I boarded the vessel in which I then was, I had begun slowly to recover, from the superior comforts of its accommodations. On the twentieth of June, we spoke the brig Olive, from N. York to this port, and the captain consenting to receive me, I arrived in Liverpool on the 1st instant, having been at sea 33 days. The despatches which were intrusted to my care, I forwarded to Mr. Forbes in charge of Captain Hinman, of the William Tell, to whom he was consigned, stating the reasons of my not bearing them in person, and requesting him to forward those for Mr. Raguet at Rio. If the William Tell goes safely, the despatches will safely reach their destination.

These, Sir, are the circumstances which have brought me to England, and I hope that they are such as to excuse my abandonment of my charge. As I am here, I have determined to devote a few weeks to the purpose of seeing the country, after which I shall have the pleasure of giving you, in person, a more detailed account of my voyage.

With high respect your obedient servant.

JOHN H. PLEASANTS.

(D.)

Extract of a letter from John H. Pleasants to Mr. Clay, dated New York, October 22, 1824.

[5.]

"Convinced, as I am, that my life would have fallen a sacrifice, had I persevered in the voyage, and although too ill at the moment to exert any agency in the step, I cannot help feeling uneasiness at the impressions, the apparent abandonment of my trip may have made on your mind. This uneasiness is proportioned to the frank confidence with which that trust was conferred. I shall be uneasy until I have the honor of hearing from you; and I entreat, Sir, if your engagements will permit, to address a line to me at this place, where I am forced to remain a few days."

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON RETRENCHMENT.

In the House of Representatives of the United States,

FEBRUARY, 6, 1828.

Resolved, That a Select Committee be appointed, whose duty it shall be to inquire and report to this House, if any, and what retrenchment, can be made with safety to the public interest, in the number of the officers of the Government of the United States, and in the amount of salaries which they may respectively receive; more especially to report specifically on the following heads:

1st. What reductions of expense can be made in the State Department, in the number and salaries of the officers and clerks attached to this Department; in the expenses regulating the foreign intercourse, and in the printing and distribution of the public laws of the United States.

2d. What reductions in the Treasury Department, and whether an effective system of accountability, and for the collection of the public dues, is there established.

3d. What reductions of expense can be made in the Navy Department; in the clerks and officers now acting subordinately to the Secretary of the Navy.

4th. What reductions of expense can be made in the Department of War, in the Indian Department, and in the clerks and officers now acting subordinately to the Secretary of War.

5th. What reductions of expense can be made in the number of officers, and the amount of compensation which they may receive, in the Postmaster General's Department.

And that the Committee be further instructed to examine the several contingent funds of each of these Departments, and to report the amount and objects for which disbursements have been made from these funds; and that they report the amounts, vouched and unvouched, which have been paid from the Secret Service Fund, since the first day of July, 1790, or the fund regulating the contingencies of foreign intercourse, and of the fund for the expenses of the intercourse with the Barbary Powers.

And that they further report whether the compensation of members of Congress should be reduced; and whether the fixed salaries of the officers of this House, and its contingent expenses, can, with propriety, be diminished.

And further, that they inquire whether any modification of the sinking fund act can be made, with a view of producing a more speedy extinguishment of the public debt.

Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Ingham, Mr. Sergeant, Mr. Rives, Mr. Everett, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Wright, of N. Y., were appointed the Committee, in pursuance of the said resolution.

FEBRUARY 12, 1828—10 *o'clock.*

Committee met: Present, Messrs. Hamilton, Ingham, Sergeant, Rives, and Wickliffe.

The resolution authorizing the appointment of the Committee was read by the Chairman, whereupon,

Mr. Rives moved the following resolution, which was agreed to by the Committee.

Resolved, That the Chairman of the Committee address a letter to the Head of each of the Executive Departments, and of the Post Office Department, requesting information, whether, in their opinion, there be any officers in either of those Departments who services may be dispensed with, without detriment to the public interest; or if the salaries of any of them can be reduced, consistently with justice and propriety; and, in general, whether any of the expense incident to those Departments can be reduced, without impairing the efficiency of their operations.

Mr. Ingham moved the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the Chairman may be directed to request the Secretary of the Treasury to lay before this Committee a statement of the sums of money which have been disbursed through the State Department, and settled at the Treasury upon the certificate of the President without specification, since the 1st day of July, 1790, specifying the sum paid in each year.

Mr. Wickliffe moved the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Chairman address a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting a statement, from his Department, of the amount appropriated for the contingent expenses of the Indian Department, for each year since the 1st day of January, 1825, and the objects, specifically, for which the sum has been expended, and the names of the persons to whom paid.

Mr. Sergeant proposed to amend the said resolution, by striking out the words "*1st day of January*, 1825," and inserting "*from the date of the change of the regulation of the Indian Department by the last act*;" which amendment was rejected; and Mr. Wickliffe's resolution was then adopted.

Mr. Ingham moved the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to request the Clerk of the House of Representatives to inform this Committee whether any reduction can be made in the number of clerks employed by him, or in their salaries, and in the contingent expense of the House, without injury to the public service.

Mr. Cambreleng appeared in the place of Mr. Wright, of New York, who was excused from serving on said Committee by the House.

Mr. Rives moved the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the Chairman of the Committee address a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting him to cause to be communicated to the Committee, with as little delay as possible, a statement showing the amount annually expended on each object of expenditure, out of the funds appropriated for the contingent expenses of the several Executive Departments, for the years 1825, 1826, and 1827, which has been settled at the Treasury.

Mr. Rives also moved the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the Chairman of the Committee address a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting him to cause to be communicated to the Committee, with as little delay as possible, a statement showing the amount annually expended on each object of expenditure, and settled at the Treasury, out of the funds appropriated for the contingencies, enumerated and not enumerated, of the naval service, and the contingencies of the military service, for the years 1825, 1826, and 1827.

And then the Committee adjourned.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY, 18, 1828.

Committee met: Present, Messrs. Ingham, Sergeant, Rives, Wickliffe, and Cambreleng.

The following resolution was submitted by Mr. Ingham, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Chairman request the Secretary of the Treasury to lay before the Committee a statement of the respective sums disbursed from the appropriations for the outfits and salaries of public ministers; for the contingent expenses of missions abroad; for intercourse with the Barbary Powers; and that part of the appropriation for the contingent expense of foreign intercourse which has been settled at the Treasury in the usual manner; specifying the objects of the disbursements, and to whom paid, since the 1st January, 1822.

And then the Committee adjourned.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1828.

Committee met: Present, Messrs. Hamilton, Everett, Ingham, Cambreleng, and Wickliffe.

The Chairman laid before the Committee the following copy of the circular addressed to the different Departments, requesting the information by the several resolutions passed:

"WASHINGTON, Feb. 13, 1828.

SIR: I do myself the honor of transmitting you a copy of a resolution adopted yesterday by the Committee on Retrenchment; and beg leave to solicit your attention to that part of it relating to your Department, from which the Committee will be happy to receive the information required."

Mr. Everett asked permission to have it entered on the Journal of the Committee, that he had been prevented from attending the former meetings of the Committee, in consequence of absence from Washington, in attendance on a member of his family dangerously sick.

The Chairman laid before the Committee the answers of the Postmaster General, and Clerk of the House of Representatives, to the resolutions directed to them.

Mr. Wickliffe offered the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be requested to furnish this Committee with a statement of the amount paid as compensation to the officers of the Navy, for and on account of extra duty for the year 1826; showing the amount paid to each officer, and for what duty or services paid.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to furnish this Committee with a statement of the amount paid as compensation to the officers of the army, for and on account of extra duty for the year 1826; showing the amount paid to each officer, and for what services paid.

Mr. Everett proposed to amend these resolutions, by striking out of each "for the year 1826," and inserting *from the 1st March* 1821

which amendment was lost, and the resolutions were then agreed to.

Mr. Ingham moved the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the Chairman request the Clerk of the House of Representatives to lay before the Committee the original accounts for printing and other contingencies for the House of Representatives, during the last session.

And then the Committee adjourned.

MONDAY, March 3, 1828.

Committee met: Present, Messrs. Hamilton, Sergeant, Everett, Rives, Ingham, and Cambreleng.

The Chairman reported that, on the day after the adoption of the resolutions, at the last meeting of the Committee, he caused to be communicated to the proper persons, copies of the said resolutions.

The Chairman also reported and read a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, in answer to the resolution of 12th February, adopted, which was received by him on the 27th February.

The Chairman (Mr. Hamilton) further communicated that the Secretary of the Treasury had, on the 27th February, verbally informed him that the clerks in his Department were busily engaged in making out the documents required by the resolution of the Committee, of the 12th February, and that the answer would be communicated in the first of the present week.

Mr. Ingham moved the following resolution, which was agreed to:

Resolved, That the Chairman address a letter to the Secretary of State, and of the Treasury, and of War, requesting them to inform the Committee when they may expect to receive an answer to the letter of the Chairman, of the 13th February, respecting the reduction in the number and salaries of the officers attached to their Departments, and the contingent expenses of the same.

Mr. Ingham also moved the following resolution, which was agreed to:

Resolved, That the Chairman of the Committee request the Secretary of the Navy to inform the Committee, what number of sick officers and seamen, and marines, were provided for at the several Naval Hospitals during the year 1826.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives produced his accounts in obedience to the order of the Committee, which, on motion of Mr. Ingham, were referred to a committee of three; and Mr. Ingham, Mr. Sergeant, and Mr. Wickliffe, were appointed said committee.

And then the committee adjourned.

SATURDAY, March 8, 1828.

Committee met: Present Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Everett, Mr. Rives, Mr. Wickliffe, Mr. Cambreleng, Mr. Sergeant, and Mr. Ingham.

The Chairman laid before the committee, reports from the Department of the Treasury, viz:

1st. A letter containing documents No. 1, 2, 3, and 4, giving amount of the contingent expenses in the Department of State, Navy, War, and Treasury offices, &c.

2d. A letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the subject of reducing the number of offices and the amount of salaries.

Also, reports from the Departments of War and State, upon the same subject.

Resolved, That the letter of the Clerk of the House, on the mode of printing and arranging the documents, be referred to the Committee on the Expenditure of the Contingent Fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Rives moved the following resolution, which was agreed to:

Resolved, That the communications from the Heads of the Executive Departments to the Chairman of this Committee, be referred to sub-committees of three members, with instructions to consider and report thereon to the committee.

The committee then resolved that their next meeting shall be on Thursday next, and every Monday and Thursday morning after, at 10 o'clock.

And then the committee adjourned.

THURSDAY, March 13, 1828.

Committee met: Present, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Rives, Mr. Everett, Mr. Sergeant, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Cambreleng.

The Chairman announced the following sub-committees, under the resolution of the last meeting:

On all communications from the Treasury Department, Mr. Cambreleng, Mr. Sergeant, and Mr. Ingham.

On all communications from the War Department, Mr. Ingham, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Everett.

On all communications from the Navy Department, Mr. Rives, Mr. Sergeant, and Mr. Cambreleng.

On all communications from the State Department, Mr. Wickliffe, Mr. Everett, and Mr. Rives.

The Chairman read the communication from the Secretary of War, in answer to the resolution of the 25th Febuary, 1828, upon the subject of the extra pay to officers of the army.

Ordered, That the same be referred to the Committee on the Accounts and Reports of the Department of War.

Mr. Cambreleng moved the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to furnish a statement exhibiting the present organization of the Treasury Department; and, more especially, showing the mode of presenting, adjusting, and paying accounts, with and against the United States, and the several Departments; and of issuing drafts and warrants for the payment of money to individuals, or for the several departments of the public service; also, stating the duties assigned to, and discharged by, the Secretary of the Treasury, First, and Second Comptrollers, Treasurer, and Register of the Treasury; First, Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Auditors, respectively, under and by existing regulations.

Mr. Everett moved the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the Secretary of war be requested to furnish this committee with a statement of the amount paid annually as compensation to the officers of the army, for and on account of extra duty, from the 4th of March, 1821, to the present time, showing the amount paid to each officer, and for what service paid, except for the year 1826.

Mr. Rives moved the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to furnish this committee with statements, showing the sums expended on each object of expenditure, out of the funds appropriated for the contingent expenses of the several Executive Departments, for the years 1822, 1823 and 1824, similar to those already furnished for the years 1825, 1826, and 1827.

And then the committee adjourned.

MONDAY, March 17, 1828.

Committee met: All present.

The Chairman announced that he had transmitted to the appropriate Departments, the resolutions passed at the last meeting: he also announced that he had received no further answers to the previous calls of the committee; but he had understood, verbally, that the contingent accounts of foreign intercourse would be transmitted in the course of a day or two.

On motion of Mr. Everett, the hour of the meeting was changed from 10 to 11 o'clock, in the morning.

The committee then adjourned.

THURSDAY, March 20, 1828.

Committee met: Present, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Rives, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Cambreleng.

The Chairman communicated that he had received a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, accompanying the contingent expenses of the Indian Department, for each year since the 1st January, 1825, marked A, and numbered from 1 to 14.

Also, a communication covering a statement for contingencies, enumerated, and not enumerated, for the naval service.

The first communication was referred to the Sub-committee on the War Department, and the last to the Sub-committee on the Navy Department.

And also a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, covering a statement of sums disbursed from the appropriations for the outfits and salaries of public ministers; for the contingent expenses of missions abroad; for the intercourse with the Barbary powers; and that part of the appropriation of the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse which has been settled at the Treasury, in the usual manner; specifying the object of the disbursement, and to whom paid, since January, 1822.

Which communication was referred to the Sub-committee on the State Department.

And then the Committee adjourned.

MONDAY, March 24,,1828.

Committee met; Present, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Ingham, Mr. Rives, Mr. Everett, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Cambreleng.

After the reading of the Journal,

Mr. Everett desired to have it entered on the same, that he was prevented from attending the last meeting, by the death of a member of his family.

The Chairman reported that since the last meeting of the Committee, no further answers had been received from the Departments to the calls of the Committee, but he understood that those remaining were in progress, and would be shortly communicated.

Mr. Wickliffe offered the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the Chairman of the Committee address a letter to the Secretary of State, to ascertain the following facts:

Did John H. Pleasants go as bearer of despatches from the United States to Rio Janeiro and Buenos Ayres, in 1825?

Did he deliver the despatches to the proper authority at Rio Janeiro and Buenos Ayres?

If he did not go, what became of the despatches? who bore them to the governments of Rio Janeiro and Buenos Ayres?

Where did J. H. Pleasants go after he left the United States? Was it not known to the Department, when his account was settled and paid him, that he had not been to Buenos Ayres as the bearer of despatches from this Government?

The Committee adjourned, to meet at 11 o' clock on Thusday next.

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1828.

Committee met: Present, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Ingham, Mr. Rives, Mr. Everett, Mr. Wikliffe, and Mr. Chambeleng.

The Chairman communicated a copy of his note to the Secretary of State, enclosing a copy of the resolution adopted by the Committee at its last meeting.

He also communicated Mr. Clay's reply to the same, containing sundry letters respecting the employment of John Hamblin Pleasants, as bearer of dispatches to Rio Janeiro and Buenos Ayres; which, after being read, were referred to the Sub-committee on the Department of State.

The Chairman also communicated a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, covering a statement of the amount paid as compensation to the officers of the Navy, for and on account of extra duty, for the year 1826; showing the amount paid to each officer, and for what duty or service paid; which was referred to the Sub-committee on the Navy Department.

The Committee then adjourned, to meet again on Thursday next, at 10 o'clock.

THURSDAY, April 3, 1828.

Committee met: Present, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Cambreleng, Mr. Everett, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Rives.

The Chairman communicated a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, accompanied by a statement showing the "number of officers, seamen and marines provided for at the several Navy Hospitals during the year 1826;" which was referred to the Sub-committee on the Navy Department.

Mr. Wickliffe offered the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the Chairman ask of the House leave to send for persons and papers.

The Committee then adjourned to Saturday, 10 o'clock.

SATURDAY, April 5, 1828.

The Chairman met to adjourn the Committee, by instructions of a majority of the Committee, during its recess, in consequence of the continued indisposition of Mr. Sargeant, and the absence of Mr. Ingham.

The members of the Committee were then summoned to meet on Monday, April 7, at 10 o'clock

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1828.

The Committee met pursuant to adjournment: Present, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Cambreleng, Mr. Everett, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Rives.

The Chairman communicated the resolution adopted by the House on the 4th instant, in the following words:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on the subject of Retrenchment be empowered to send for persons and papers.

The Chairman also communicated a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, accompanied by statements of the contingent expenditures of the State, Treasury, War, and Navy Departments, for the years 1822, 1823, and 1824, together with a general abstract thereof, which were severally referred to the sub-committees on those Departments.

The Chairman also communicated a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, on the organization of the Treasury Department, &c., accompanied by communications from the subordinate officers of the Treasury, numbered from 1 to 9, being in compliance with a resolution of the Committee adopted on the 13th March; which papers were referred to the sub-committee on the Treasury Department, &c.

Mr. Wickliffe offered the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That summons be issued for Thos. B. Dashiel and G. W. Dashiel, James McCleary, and James Laurie, to attend the Committee on Wednesday next, at 9 o'clock.

The Committee then adjourned to Wednesday, at 10 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1828.

The Committee met: Present, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Cambreleng; Mr. Everett, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Rives.

Several witnesses, to wit. Thos. B. Dashiel, George W. Dashiel, Dr. Laurie, and James McCleary, attended, in pursuance of a summons from the Chairman.

Thomas B. Dashiel, George W. Dashiel, and Dr. Laurie, were severally sworn and examined.

The following are questions propounded to Thomas B. Dashiel, and answers given.

Ques. In what office are you clerk?

Ans. In the office of the Treasurer.

Ques. Who is Chief Clerk in the Treasurer's office?

Ans. I am acting as Chief Clerk pro tempore. Samuel Brooks, who has retired for 12 months, from old age, from the office, is the regular Chief Clerk of the office.

Ques. What is his salary, as fixed by law?

Ans. His salary is $ 1,700 per annum.

Ques. How long since he has done any duty in the office of the Treasurer?

Ans. About twelve months.

Ques. Who performs the duties of Chief Clerk in the Treasurer's office?

Ans. I do.

Ques. Did or did not the said Samuel Brooks agree with you, or some other of the clerks in the Department, that, if you or they would do his business as Chief Clerk, he would give you $ 900 of his salary? If he did not make such agreement, state what agreement he did make.

Ans. Mr. Brooks made no agreement with me: when he retired from the office, Mr. Tucker directed me to do the business. There was no agreement between Mr. Brooks and myself, whatever.

Ques. Has he received any portion of his salary since he left the office and ceased to do business?

Answer. Mr. Brooks received a salary at the rate of 1,400 dollars per annum, for the first three months after he retired; since which time, he has received at the rate of 800 dollars per annum.

Question. Who receives the balance of the 1,700 dollars appropriated by law?

Answer. I receive, in addition to my salary, 300 dollars, as fixed by law, making my compensation equal to 1,700 dollars; George W. Dashiel receives, in addition to his salary, as fixed by law, the sum of 250 dollars; B. B. Beall receives, in addition to his salary, 150 dollars; G. Beall receives, in addition to his salary, 200 dollars; and the duties heretofore performed by G. Beall are performed by Mr. Moore, the messenger, who receives, as assistant clerk, a fixed salary of 400 dollars. He does no duty as assistant clerk to the chief clerk: the same quantum of labor is now performed in the office, by those persons above-mentioned, as was performed by the whole clerks when Mr. Brooks was in the office: no inconvenience results from the absence of Mr. Brooks.

Question. What are the age and circumstances of Mr. Brooks, and how long has he been in office?

Answer. His age is about 77 years: his circumstances are considered good. He entered the office about 1792: he has occasionally been indisposed, sometimes confined for a week or ten days. The assistant clerk was granted in 1818, as well as I can recollect.

Question. Why was the assistant clerk granted?

Answer. He was granted in consequence of the old age of Mr. Brooks, who could not get along with the business as well as was required.

George W. Dashiel states, upon interrogatories, that Mr. Brooks retired from office on account of his inefficiency to perform the duties of Chief Clerk: he rather retarded the business than otherwise: he received his salary for about three months after he retired. Some time after he retired the arrangement was made by the Treasurer, by which he was to receive 800 dollars of his salary, and the promotions took place with the increase of salary as stated by Thomas B. Dashiel. Mr. Brooks has no wife or family. He is unable to state what are his circumstances.

Questions propounded to Dr. Laurie.

Question. What portion of time does Anthony Morris devote to public duties in the the office of the Register of the Treasury; and what duties has he performed for the last twelve months?

Answer. I am not employed in the same room in that office, and therefore cannot say to what extent of time devoted, or duties performed by Mr. Morris.

Mr. Wickliffe offered the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That a summons be issued for Michael Nourse, to attend as a witness before this Committee.

The Chairman communicated a letter from

the Secretary of War, with communications from the Second and Third Auditors, &c.; which were referred to the Sub-committee on the War Department.

The Committee then adjourned to Saturday, 9 o'clock.

SATURDAY, April 12, 1828.

The Committee met: Present, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Ingham, Mr. Everett, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Cambreleng.

The Chairman then stated that a subpœna had been returned, as duly served on Mr. Michael Nourse, the Chief Clerk of the Register's Office, who now attended to answer such questions touching any inquiry the Committee might make of him.

Mr. Nourse being sworn,

Mr. Wickliffe propounded the following questions:

Are you acquainted with Mr. Anthony Morris, clerk in the Register's Office? State the duties he performs, and the proportion of time, throughout the year, he is engaged in the discharge of the same. *Ans.* Witness says he is acquainted with Mr. Morris. He is a clerk in the Register's Office. He does not know the duties he performs. Mr. Morris is in a room by himself, and he does not know how much he is engaged.

Do you believe his services to the Government essential to the regular discharge of the business of the Register's Office? And are they, in your opinion, worth the salary of $1,400 paid him?

Ans. Witness does not feel himself authorized to express an opinion, as he is not particularly acquainted with the duties performed by Mr. Morris.

By Mr. Everett. When, and by whom, was Mr. Morris appointed clerk?

Ans. He was appointed, witness thinks, about three years ago next fall: his appointment was made by the Register, with the approbation, he thinks, of Mr. Crawford.

By Mr. Cambreleng. Who filled the office before Mr. Morris's appointment?

Ans. Mr. Charles Dawson.

By Mr. Wickliffe. Do you know what duties Mr. Dawson performed?

Ans. He kept the impost book, and assisted in forming the commercial statements.

By Mr. Cambreleng. Does Mr. Morris now keep the impost book and commercial statements?

Ans. No: Mr. Patterson attends to the first, and the labor of the second is divided between different clerks.

By Mr. Everett. What is the usual way in which clerks in the Register's Office are appointed?

Ans. They are appointed by the Register, generally, with the approbation of the Secretary.

By Mr. Ingham. Do you know whether the Secretary of the Treasury has appointed a clerk in a branch of the Treasury without an application from the head of that subordinate branch?

Ans. I do not know that he has.

Do you know whether any of the duties which were performed by Mr. Dawson, are now or ever have been discharged by Mr. Morris?

Ans. They are not now performed by Mr. Morris; but when Mr. Morris first entered the office, he entered on the duties of Mr. Dawson.

By Mr. Everett. How long did Mr. Morris perform the duties of Mr. Dawson, and why did he cease to perform them?

Ans. Witness does not recollect: he believes less than a year. He does not know why he ceased to perform them.

By Mr. Wickliffe. Do you not know that Mr. Morris is often absent from his duties in office hours?

Ans. Witness answers, that he does not know, when in the city, how much, or how often, Mr. Morris may be absent in office hours; but that he has been absent, since his appointment, about three months in each year, in consequence of his own ill health, and that of his daughters, as he believes.

Mr. Nourse asked permission to state that he had been informed that Mr. Brooks' circumstances were not good: that he was in debt: and that he had not a clear income of more than $100 or $200.

Mr. Ingham submitted the following resolution, which was agreed to:

Resolved, That a subpœna be issued to the Register of the Treasury.

The Committee then adjourned, to meet on Wednesday next, at 9 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, April 16, 1828.

Committee met: Present, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Everett, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Cambreleng.

The Chairman stated, that, in conformity with the directions of the committee, he had issued a summons to Mr. Nourse, the Register of the Treasury, who had attended, and was now present to give testimony.

Mr. Nourse was accordingly sworn, and the following is his testimony:

Question. What is the nature and extent of duties performed by Mr. Morris?

Answer. Mr. Morris was absent when the other clerks were directed to state their duties; consequently, did not render a statement, but has since written a letter.

[Letter of Mr. Morris read and filed.]

Witness had classed Mr. Morris's service under three heads: Correspondence, Statistics, Miscellaneous. With regard to correspondence, in which Mr. Morris is his aid, he is the only literary man in the office on whom witness can call. Witness being conversant with the details of matters relative to the old Government, is often written to on them, and calls on Mr. Morris to aid in answering.

2d. *Statistics.* Mr. Morris was put on the books as a man of education, better adapted to that branch than to common clerical duty, and was employed to carry on the work of Seybert, as an undertaking of great use and convenience to the Government. Has made a great many selections of a statistical nature, but principally employed in preparatory researches.

3d. Mr. Morris, has charge of *statement* books: has arranged the index to 15 vols. and prepared a great mass of papers relative to old Government transactions. It is the situation of his family which has called him away.

Ques. At what hour does Mr. Morris come to the office every day?

Ans. About 10 o'clock every day.

Ques. How long does he stay?

Ans. Excepting when he is wanted, he generally goes away at half past 2, or a little before 3 o'clock, as he lives at a distance from the office.

Ques. Is he not absent, on an average, at least from two to three months, each year?

Ans. Witness has not taken a particular record: refers to the letter of Mr. Morris. Witness thinks he is absent on an average of two months; but probably will not be hereafter, in consequence of the death of his daughter.

Ques. Is this a customary indulgence?

Ans. The clerks are not indulged in absence, unless called by circumstances. Witness considers himself as standing in a paternal relation to the officers under him.

Ques. Do you consider his services necessary?

Ans. Thinks that, at witness's time of life, such an aid to himself is required.

Ques. Do you consider his services deserving the salary of $1,400 per annum?

Ans. Thinks an officer of his talents deserving the salary of $1,400.

Ques. Has Mr. Morris made out an answer to any call within twelve months, relative to any matter contained in the 15 vols.?

Ans. The call relative to the claim of Walter Livingston, requiring laborious research, was referred to Mr. Morris, and the answer prepared by him.

Ques. Were not the duties performed by Mr. Morris, formerly those of Register and Chief Clerk?

Ans. These duties were witness's own, and he considers Mr. Morris more particularly as his aid. Mr. Morris was appointed in November, 1822, by Mr. Crawford, with the concurrence of Register, and implied patronage of Mr. Madison, who had sent him on a private mission to Spain, and was paid out of the $100,000 granted during the war for special services.

The Chairman then submitted a letter from Mr. Nourse, Register of the Treasury, as to the duties performed by Mr. Morris.

He also submitted a letter from Mr. Lee, Second Auditor, containing a list of the clerks in his office, and the duties they perform.

And then the Committee adjourned, to meet when summoned by the Chairman.

THURSDAY, April 24, 1828.

The Committee met: Present, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Everett, Mr. Rives, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Cambreleng.

The Chairman stated to the Committee, that he had not previously summoned them, in consequence of the continued indisposition and sickness of Messrs. Sergeant and Ingham.

He also communicated the following letter from Mr. Nourse, the Register of the Treasury, explanatory of his testimony, viz:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
REGISTER'S OFFICE, *April* 16, 1828.

Recollecting one of the questions of this morning before the Committee, in respect to occasional absence of the other clerks, I answered, "It was not." At that moment the period of two months was in my mind. I should have said, "It is usual, on application of clerks, on special applications to be absent with leave, and the period of distance, has, in a measure, governed the grants as to the time of absence: but not generally for 'two months;' unless sickness intervened."

I have the honor to be, &c.
JOSEPH NOURSE.

The following resolution was offered by Mr. Wickliffe, and agreed to:

Resolved, That summons issue for George Graham, the Commissioner of the Land Office, Richard Cutts, and Colonel McKenney, to appear at the next meeting of the Committee, and give testimony.

The Chairman was then instructed by the Committee to apply to the House for leave to sit during the sessions of the House.

And then the Committee adjourned, to meet at half past 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

FRIDAY MORNING, April 25, 1828.

The Committee met: Present, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Rives, Mr. Everett, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Cambreleng.

The Chairman stated to the Committee, that George Graham, R. Cutts, and Col. McKenney, attended, to give testimony.

Upon Mr. Graham's being sworn, he testified as follows:

Question. What is the utility of continuing the system of inspecting the Land Office?

Ans. The duty of the examiner is to examine and count the money reported to be in the hands of the Receiver; to compare the books of the Register and Receiver together, in order to see whether they correspond; to make a report as to the manner in which the books are kept, in respect to the neatness and correctness, and whether they are brought up to the period of examination. The practice of these examinations has existed since 1804, in pursuance of law, although with some variations in the mode.

Ques. Could not the business be as well done by some citizen in the neighborhood?

Ans. In the early period there were few offices, and Mr. Gallatin generally employed some one in the neighborhood to examine them, with a per diem of $6 per day, while actually engaged, and $5 or $6 per 20 miles for mileage. After Mr. Crawford came into office, he thought it expedient to employ persons not residing in the neighborhood, on the same allowance per diem, while actually engaged, and $5 or $6 mileage for all expenses.

Ques. Could not the examination be made as efficiently, and at a great reduction of expense, by a person living in the neighborhood of the offices?

Ans. Witness thinks it might; and it is not necessary to have an annual examination, as now prescribed by law. An occasional examination will be sufficient. In some offices, it should take place annually, but where the books were found, on one examination, well kept and brought up, an examination the next year might be dispensed with. Some offices should be examined, and the money counted, oftener than once a year. The frequency of examination might be in the discretion of the President.

Ques. When was John Scott appointed to examine land offices; and what amount of compensation was made, or to be made to him?

Ans. Thinks he was appointed in March or April, 1827; examined the offices, in the course of last summer and fall, in Missouri and Arkansas. Has made report of the examinations, but

has rendered no account for his services. Has received, from the different Receivers, about $400, as appears from their returns; and has drawn a bill on the Department for $500, which has not been paid, in consequence of his not having yet rendered his accounts. He will be entitled to $6 per diem, for every day employed in actual examination, and $5 or $6 per every 20 miles, computed from his residence; such being the standing allowance. This compensation has been paid in various ways: no specific appropriation has been made, by law, for its payment. Each examiner, when appointed, is furnished with a letter of credit to the Receiver of each office which he examines. Amount paid on each letter is charged to the contingencies of the sale of public lands. It is an indefinite letter of credit, but agents seldom draw more than $100 dollars from any office. Examiner reports the number of days that he has been employed in each office: if an unreasonable number of days be reported, an inquiry will be ordered. Witness does not recollect any case of more than four or five days reported for one office. Where the examiner does not receive all that he is entitled to at the offices, he sends his account to the Treasury, and is paid out of the annual appropriation for payments of accounts not otherwise provided for, or by order on some one of the Receivers.

Ques. What mileage was Mr. Scott entitled to?

Ans. The amount of miles travelled by him is not known as yet at the land office, and for this reason the settlement of his account has been suspended. Mr. Scott has made all his reports, and finished his agency. His reports were delayed by sickness, but his accounts are not yet rendered; and not knowing what he is entitled to as mileage, his draft has not been paid. He examined seven offices in Missouri and Arkansas.

The Committee then proceeded to the examination of Mr. Cutts, Comptroller of the Treasury, who, being sworn, was merely interrogated in explanation of certain items in the account of the contingent expenses of the Indian Department; but as a reference to the vouchers in his office was necessary before he could render his answers, his examination was postponed, as well as that of Col. McKenney.

The Chairman then stated to the Committee, that he felt it his duty to mention, that a citizen, now a resident of this District, had inquired of him whether, in any of the accounts of the contingent expenses of the Government, the U. States were debited with the sum of five thousand five hundred dollars, paid to the late Daniel P. Cook, late a Representative in Congress, from the State of Illinois, for certain diplomatic services, upon which Mr. Cook was supposed to have been sent abroad during the last summer?

The individual making this communication also stated that he had good reason to *believe*, that the Hon. Mr. Barton, of the Senate, and the Hon. Mr. Letcher, of the House of Representatives, were acquainted with this fact, and that he had good reason to *know* that John McLean, Esq. Postmaster General, was also conuzant of the circumstances connected with this transaction.

The Chairman stated that he did not feel at liberty to communicate the name of his informant, but in regard to the purport of the communication he felt no such reserve, and it was for the Committee to make such order on the statement as they might deem proper.

It was, on motion of Mr. Cambreleng,

Resolved, That the Committee consider the communication: when Mr. Wickliffe moved, that the Committee proceed to the examination of the fact stated, and that the Chairman request the attendance of Messrs. Letcher and Barton, and issue a summons for the Postmaster General.

Mr. Everett stated to the Committee, that, desiring to confer with Mr. Sergeant, who was absent from indisposition, on the very important subject involved in the communication, he would move that its consideration be postponed until to-morrow, Saturday, the 26th, at 12 o'clock, (meridian,) which was carried, *nem con.*

Then the Committee adjourned, to meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

SATURDAY, April 26, 1823.

Committee met: Present, Mr. Hamilton, (Chairman,) Mr. Sergeant, Mr. Rives, Mr. Everett, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Cambreleng.

The Chairman submitted the following letter from Mr. Graham, Commissioner of the General Land Office, explanatory of his testimony taken on yesterday:

"General Land Office.

"*April* 25, 1823.

"Sir: In the statement made by me to the Committee, I omitted to mention that, in a conversation had with the Secretary of the Treasury, last autumn, previous to the session of Congress, I understood him to say that, for the future, the letter of credit given to the examiners of the Land Offices should be more restricted and limited in its terms. If deemed necessary, you will please file this as a part of my testimony.

With very great respect, &c.

"GEO. GRAHAM."

The Committee then proceeded to the consideration of the motion, that the Committee proceed to the examination of the fact stated in the communication of the Chairman: and that the Chairman request the attendance of Messrs. Barton and Letcher, and issue a summons for the Postmaster General *forthwith*.

And, upon the question being taken, Messrs. Rives, Wickliffe, and Cambreleng, voted in the affirmative, and Messrs. Sergeant and Everett in the negative.

The Chairman then transmitted notes to Messrs. Barton and Letcher, and issued a subpœna to the Postmaster General, all of whom attended.

The Hon. Mr. Barton, of the Senate, attended as a witness, and being sworn, testified as follows:

Ques. Are you acquainted with the fact, that the late D. P. Cook was employed by the Government of the United States, on foreign service, at the commencement of the last summer?

Ans. Witness understood from Mr. Cook himself, that, as Mr. Cook was going to the Island of Cuba for his health, he was, while there, to be employed in the service of the Government, to collect such information as the Government

ight wish to have relative to that country. He as sick at the close of the session, and wit- ess remained with him, and went with him to hiladelphia, where he left witness and went to ew York. Witness had intended to go round ith him, by the way of Cuba, but declined do- g so, on account of the advanced season.

Ques. Did you understand what compensa- on Mr. Cook was to have for his services?

Ans. Witness understood that an advance was ade to him of 1,000 dollars.

Ques. Did you learn what additional sum he as to receive for his services, or whether he as to receive any?

Ans. Witness did not understand whether here was to be any further compensation.

Ques. What was the situation of Mr. Cook's ealth at the time he received this appointment?

Ans. He was supposed to be recovering from he sickness which he had had during the ses- ion. At the close of the session he was very l. Witness remained with him till about farch 20th, when he was much better, and hen accompanied him to Philadelphia, where itness staid with him until April, and he con- inued to get better.

Ques. Did Mr. Cook stop at Philadelphia on ccount of his health?

Ans. When he left Washington, he had the ntention to sail from Philadelphia or New York, ut designed also to stop at Philadelphia, and onsult Dr. Physick with respect to his health.

Ques. After Mr. Cook concluded to go out o Cuba, in service of the United States, was e obliged to stay here on account of his ealth?

Ans. It was not long before witness started or Philadelphia, that witness heard Mr. Cook would be thus employed.

Ques. Do you know if Mr. Cook spoke the Spanish language?

Ans. Witness does not know whether he did or not; but thinks, from his acquaintance with him since he was a boy, that he did not.

Ques. From the situation in which you left Mr. Cook, in Philadelphia, did you think him capable of attending thoroughly to business, public or private?

Ans. Did not think him so at the time; but f his health had continued to improve as it had done from the adjournment, witness thinks he would soon have been able to attend to business. Did not, however, think he would permanently recover from a pulmonary complaint with which he was seriously afflicted.

Ques. Do you or do you not know, that, at the time Mr. Cook was sick, he was an appli- cant for the appointment of Minister to Colom- bia?

Ans. He had heard such a thing spoken of, not only at that moment, but during that spring. Witness lived with Mr. Cook.

Ques. On what points did you understand that Mr. Cook was to collect information?

Ans. On the state of public affairs general- ly; witness thinks he heard no particulars.

Ques. Did you hear the reason assigned why he did not receive the appointment to Colombia?

Ans. Witness did not hear any special reason assigned, or if he did, does not remember it.

Ques. Have you any recollection of hearing that this mission to Cuba was an alternative for the mission to Colombia, which, for certain rea- sons, could not be given him?

Ans. Witness heard no such idea suggested. Witness had probably about the same know- ledge of the application for the appointment to Colombia that most members of Congress had, which was, in general, that he desired it, but did not obtain it.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. Do you know when Mr. Cook returned?

Ans. Thinks it was the latter end of May, or beginning of June, that he returned.

Ques. When did Mr. Cook probably sail from New York?

Ans. Does not know, but presumes some time in April. Witness parted from him be- tween 5th and 10th of April, at Philadelphia, when Mr. Cook went to New York, to sail.

Question by Mr. Cambreleng. Do you know that Mr. Cook did not receive any thing more than the 1000 dollars advanced to him when he left Washington?

Ans. Witness does not know that he receiv- ed no more.

Questions by Mr. Everett. Do you know who was Governor General of Cuba, at that time?

Ans. Thinks it was General Vives, formerly Minister in this country.

Ques. Have you any reason to believe that, while General Vives was in this country, he learned to speak the English language?

Ans. Thinks while he was here he might have made some progress.

Ques. by Mr. Cambreleng. Do you know General Vives?

Ans. Witness saw him while he was here: had no personal acquaintance with him; was, perhaps, introduced to him, does not recollect that he ever conversed with him.

Ques. By Mr. Sergeant. Do you recollect whether Mr. Cook had formerly been employed abroad by the Government?

Ans. Was sent (witness believes) to Lon- don, by Mr. Madison, to carry despatches.

Ques. By Mr. Rives. Do you know that he returned from London with Mr. Adams?

Ans. Thinks he has heard Mr. Cook say so.

Ques. By Mr. Cambreleng. Was Mr. Cook able to go out when he was here, and attend to business?

Ans. Not much, out rode out occasionally to the public offices, before he left Philadel- phia was able to walk out on business.

Mr. Letcher was next sworn, and testified as follows:

Ques. Have you any knowledge whether Mr. Cook received an appointment from the Gov- ernment of the United States, in March or April last?

Ans. Witness has no knowledge; but has understood so during this session of Congress, from the Postmaster General or Mr. Clay, in some casual conversation. Does not certainly remember to have heard Mr. Clay say so. Is pretty confident it was one of the two, and is not sure which.

Ques. Did you remain here at the close of the last session of Congress?

Ans. No. Witness left Congress a few days before the adjournment.

Ques. Did Mr. Cook ever tell you he desir- ed an appointment?

Ans. He never did; but witness knows he was desirous of one.

Ques. What was the state of Mr. Cook's health at the close of the session?

Ans. It was delicate.

Ques. Did you think him fit to attend to business at that time?

Ans. It will depend on the nature of the business. Did not think him capable of attending to laborious business.

Ques. Do you know whether Mr. Cook was an applicant for the appointment of Minister to Colombia?

Ans. He was. Mr. Cook having expressed his desire to procure that appointment in conversation, asked witness's opinion of his fitness for the office, and prospect of getting it. Does not know that he ever applied to the President, but has no doubt he did, (from his conversation) either by himself or friends.

Ques. Did you ever hear, from any person connected with the Government, the reason why he did not receive the appointment?

Ans. Never did.

Ques. Do you know whether Mr. Cook spoke the Spanish language?

Ans. Thinks he did not. If he did, witness has no knowledge of it.

Question by Mr. Cambreleng. Do you recollect that Mr. Cook was unable to attend in Congress, at the close of the session?

Ans. He was unable to attend, although he had a bill of interest before the House. Some time before, he had been diligent in his attendence as Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means.

Ques. Do you know any thing about the sum of money he was to receive?

Ans. Does not.

Question by Mr. Everett Did you understand what was the nature of the duties to be discharged by Mr. Cook in Cuba?

Ans. Witness did not, but has the impression that, when he understood from Mr. Clay or the Postmaster General, that he had had such an appointment, he was also told he had done all that was expected.

Mr. John McLean, Postmaster General, appeared, was sworn, and the following is his testimony:

Ques. Have you any information, touching an appointment which the late D. P. Cook received last spring?

Ans. Witness understood from Mr. Cook, that he was appointed as a secret agent to Cuba. He was sick some weeks at witness's house, and the subject was mentioned rather confidentially to witness, but without any injunction of secrecy. Does not know that he has ever mentioned it to any one, but may have done so to Judge Letcher, and possibly to some other person; but cannot recollect with certainty.

Remark by the Chairman. The Committee are not acting under any information that they have any reason to think was derived from witness.

Ques. Did you understand from Mr. Cook the amount of compensation he was to receive?

Ans. Something was said by Mr. Cook on the subject. The sum of $5,000 per annum was named, but witness does not recollect to have heard that any sum was fixed, and this sum may have been mentioned before the appointment was made or the sum fixed.

Ques. Was not Mr. Cook confined by illness, at the time, at your house?

Ans. He was some weeks sick, at witness's house, being there by invitation, in order that he might have more comforts than he could otherwise have. Witness thought him near dying.

Ques. Did you, at that time, think that he was able to attend to any business?

Ans. Witness thought, by change of climate, he would be able to attend to business. He recovered so much, as to be able to travel to New York with considerable comfort; and witness thought, at the time he left his house, that he would be able to attend to the business confided to him.

Ques. Was Mr. Cook acquainted with the Spanish language?

Ans. Witness does not know that he was.

Ques. What was the nature of his disease?

Ans. Pulmonary; but it was thought by his physician that he might live some months, or perhaps some years.

Questions by Mr. Rives. Do you know how much money he received before he left the country, or after his return?

Ans. Witness does not know.

Ques. Have you any knowledge of any application made by Mr. Cook for the place of Minister to Colombia?

Ans. His name was before the President.

Ques. Did you ever learn that this secret mission was an alternative for the missions to Colombia?

Ans. Witness understood that it was not thought expedient to send a Minister to Colombia, and that Mr. Cook accepted of this mission. Witness does not know that it was an alternative.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. Was not his application to be Minister or Charge d'Affaires to Colombia?

Ans. Witness thinks it was to be Minister. Mr. Cook wrote a letter to witness on the subject of the appointment; witness having a high opinion of his capacity, integrity, and fitness for the office, sent the letter to the President, but had no conversation with the President or Mr. Clay on the subject: that was the application.

Question by Mr. Rives. Did you understand that, on the return of Mr. Cook to the country, he had performed all the services expected from him?

Ans. Has no distinct impression on that head.

Question by Mr. Cambreleng. Had you any knowledge of the way in which he performed the duties of his appointment?

Ans. Not any. Witness understood his health became worse on his return.

Ques. Did you ever tell any one that he had performed the duties expected of him?

Ans. Witness has no distinct recollection of doing so: if he has told any one so, it has escaped his recollection; presumes he could not have said so, as he had no particular information on the subject.

Question by Mr. Everett. Had you any understanding as to the general nature of the duties to be performed by Mr. Cook?

Ans. Witness had not; did not see his instructions, nor did Mr. Cook go into any detail in conversation.

Questions by Mr. Cambreleng. Do you suppose that Mr. Cook disguised any thing from you, or were the conversations frank?

Ans. They were frank. Mr. Cook said he expected special instructions; that he had some conversations with the President or Secretary of State, and found the business to be confided to him of more importance than he had expected, but did not go into detail nor did witness think it proper to enquire more particularly.

Do you know whether his duties were of a diplomatic character?

Ans. Does not. His impression was that the agency was of a secret nature, but could not state positively.

Question by Mr. Everett. What is your recollection as to the sum of $5,000 mentioned by Mr. Cook?

Ans. It is very indistinct. It may have referred to a probable sum to be fixed.

Question by Chairman. Did you or did you not hear Mr. Cook or some of his friends make a comparative estimate of the value of this mission, and of that to Colombia, as an inducement to accept the appointment?

Ans. Witness may have conversed with Mr. Cook on this point, and may have stated that if a fixed sum of $5,000 were given, as less expense would be incurred, it would be as good, in a pecuniary point of view, as the mission to Colombia.

Question by Mr. Everett. Do you remember to have heard that, if Mr. Cook had not received this appointment, it would have been necessary to send some other person?

Ans. Witness may have heard something like this from Mr. Cook, but does not recollect it.

The committee adjourned, to meet again on

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1828.

Committee met at ten o'clock: Present, the Chairman, Mr. Wickliffe, Mr. Sergeant, Mr. Cambreleng, and Mr. Everett.

Mr. Sergeant requested that it might be entered on the Journal of the Committee, that his absence from the meetings of the Committee had been occasioned by indisposition, which had confined him to his room.

Ordered, That Messrs. Way and Weightman be summoned, as witnesses, to attend the committee, and that Messrs. Gales and Seaton be invited to give such explanations, relative to the printing of the House, as may be required.

The Chairman submitted a letter from Mr. Letcher, explaining his testimony before the committee at the last meeting, which is as follows,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, }
Monday morning, April 25, 1828. }

SIR: In answer to an inquiry, propounded to me by one of the Committee on Retrenchment, Saturday evening last, whether I was here at the close of the last session of Congress, I replied I was not, that I left the city a few days before the termination of the session. Such was my unqualified opinion at the moment. I find, however, upon reflection, I labored under a misapprehension, and that I remained here until the close of the session. Although the mistake might not be very material in reference to the subject matter about which I was examined, yet as I am desirous of being accurate, I must ask the favor of the committee, to allow me to correct my statement in the aforesaid particular.

With great respect,

Your obedient servant,

R. P. LETCHER.

Hon. JAMES HAMILTON, *Chairman, &c.*

The committee adjourned, to meet again at 12 o'clock.

The Committee met pursuant to adjournment:

When Mr. Andrew Way appeared, was sworn, and testified as follows:

Ques. 1. What is the difference between the number of ems contained in a page of the size of the edition of the Laws, of 1815, and in a page of the [illegible] the documents as printed by Gales & S[illegible]

Ans. About [illegible] hundred and fifty-five, making from one-third to one half a page in eight of continuous printing. In printing a work like the Journal, containing numerous breaks, the difference in the number of ems in the width would produce little or no saving. The difference in the number of lines on the page of the Journal, and that of the Laws, might amount to a third of a page in eight. The charge of printers for seven full pages, and a part of the eighth or a blank page, would be the same as for eight full pages.

Ques. 2. In consequence of the difference between the two sizes of the pages, might not the printer, in printing a document that might be compressed into four pages of the large size, occasionally extend it to a fifth page, and thus lead to an extra charge for the fifth page and the sixth blank page?

Ans. He would not go over the fourth page for a few lines, but if it were necessary to go over the fourth page, would charge for half a sheet.

3. *Question by Mr. Everett.* On what proportion of the printing done for the House, would the less arising from the different size of pages accrue?

Ans. It would be impossible to say, exactly, without carefully examining the whole. It would accrue on a small part only of the printing. It would accrue on large continuous documents only, and not at all on table work, nor on documents containing from four to sixteen pages each.

4. *Question by Mr. Everett.* Would not the printer, for his own convenience and interest, crowd a small excess over a signature into the signature, rather than subjoin an additional leaf?

Ans. He would, because he would suffer more in filling up the blank page and in the extra stitching, than he would gain by the extra charge. It would be considered discreditable to throw a few extra lines on a ninth page and charge accordingly.

5. *Question by Mr. Seaton.* From your knowledge of the manner in which the public printing has been done by the present printers, and by any others, do you not think that it has been done very much better in respect to economy and despatch, by the present printers, than by any others?

Ans. Witness thinks it has, decidedly: has been astonished at the expedition with which the printing has been done by the present printers: thinks it was never so well done before: has been as neatly executed, but never with so much expedition.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. What is the loss sustained in Senate document, No. 102, of the 1st session 19th Congress, making 840 pages, in consequence of the size of the pages?

Ans. About fifty pages in consequence of the reduced length of page. Very little effect as that document would be produced by the dif-

ference in width, but it is impossible to speak accurately.

7. *Question by Mr. Everett.* What would be the loss on House document No. 112, 1st session 19th Congress, which is rule work?

Ans. There would be no loss.

8 *Question by Mr Everett.* Are they not many more documents of the same kind as the last named document than the former?

Ans. There are. There are few documents where the loss would accrue. Does not now, certainly what proportion of long documents are now published. In former years there were very few.

9. *Question by Mr. Everett.* What is your opinion of the difference in respect to economy of the mode in which such statistical tables as document No. 133, 2d session 15th Congress, printed by De Krafft, and document No. 120, 2d session 19th Congress are printed?

Ans. The difference is very great. The expense of the former mode would be four times that of the present, at the same rate per page.

10. *Question by Mr. Wickliffe.* Was not the former document printed by contract, and before resolution of 1819?

Ans. It was

11. *Question by Mr. Everett.* What was the nature of the contract under which the printing was formerly done?

Ans. Thinks it was so much per sheet, or half sheet.

12. *Question by Mr. Everett.* Might not document No 120, making 283 pages of rule and figure work, 2d session 19th Congress, under the resolution of 1819, have been printed in the same form as No. 133, 2d session 15th Congress?

Ans. According to witness's understanding of the rule, it might.

13. *Question by Mr. Everett.* About how many more pages would document No. 120, 2d session 19th Congress make, if printed in the manner just described?

Ans. Witness thinks it would make five or six times as many pages: cannot speak with certainty.

14. *Question by Mr. Wickliffe.* Is it the practice of printers, in rule and table work, to charge the same price for the blank pages as for the printed?

Ans. It is. The compositor would charge it to the printer, and consequently, the printer would charge it. If the document consisted only of one page, two would not be charged; but in a continuous work, one blank page would not be excepted.

The Committee adjourned to meet again to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, May 1, 1828.

Committee met: Present, the Chairman, Mr. Sergeant, Mr. Wickliffe, and Mr. Everett.

Mr. Cutts was again called—testified as follows:

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. What was the amount of compensation, per diem, of Thomas L. McKenney, Clerk in the War Office, for his tour to Green Bay, the last summer?

Ans. Mileage 8 dollars per 20 miles, and compensation 8 dollars per day, while in the discharge of his duties, attending the negotiation of the treaties with the Indian tribes.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. By whom was that compensation paid?

Ans. By Mr. Forsyth; amounting, as far as witness recollects, to $1,880.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. What amount of money was advanced Col. McKenney, from the Treasury, last year, on or before his departure from Washington, for the expenses of his tour from Green Bay to the South?

Ans. Seventeen hundred and fifty dollars.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. What amount, in addition to the $1,750 did he claim on his return, for his expenses after he left Green Bay?

Ans. Two thousand seven hundred and eighty-two dollars. In making this charge, he credited the United States with $1,438, being the amount of certain sums advanced to him by Gov. Cass, P. B. Key, P. Lindsley, and J. Crowell; reducing the balance claimed by him, on his return, $1,344.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. Are the sums just named all that he received from Indian Agents and others, on his tour?

Ans. He received $1,880, mentioned in the answer to a former question; 660 dollars of which was for mileage from Green Bay to Washington, which sum was disallowed at the Treasury, and debited in his account, in consequence of his not having returned directly from Green Bay to Washington, and having charged his travelling expenses on another route.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. Is paper marked No. 17, in the file presented by witness, a correct copy of a letter of the 28th January, 1828, from Col. McKenney to the Secretary of War, explaining his accounts?

Ans. It is. After the letter of witness, of the 28th January, which is appended to that of Mr. McKenney, of the same date, witness recollect another letter from Col McKenney, of the 26th, in consequence of which witness withdrew his letter of the 28th, and required Col. McKenney to furnish Mr. Schoolcraft and Forsyth's accounts.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. Is not the paper No. 2, a requisition from the Secretary of War for the balance of Col. McKenney's account, as claimed by him, sent directly to witness as Comptroller, without being first passed upon by the Second Auditor, in the usual manner, according to law?

Ans. It was.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. Why was not this account settled in the usual manner?

Ans. Because it was not made out in the usual form, nor with sufficient vouchers.

Question by Mr. Everett. Do you know what reasons induced the Secretary of War to grant the requisition under these circumstances?

Ans. Does not know.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. Do you know of any account presented by Col. McKenney for the expenses of an entertainment given at Green Bay?

Ans. Witness does not know any thing of such an account. If it had been presented for an entertainment given on Col. McKenney's late tour, witness would have known it.

Question by Mr. Wickliffe. How long was Col. McKenney absent on his tour?

Ans. Witness thinks he went in May, and returned in November.

Question by Mr. Everett. Was the compen-

tion allowed to Col. McKenney on the tour to Green Bay, that which is usually paid for similar services?

Ans. It was. But the allowance for his subsequent tour to the southern tribes being a gross sum, witness does not know whether it is the same usually paid for similar services.

Question by Mr. Everett. In what way are accounts of this nature usually settled?

Ans. They are first passed upon by the Auditor, who reports to the Second Comptroller, by whom they are revised, and the balance due certified to the Head of the Department in which the expenditure was incurred. On this report or certificate of the Second Comptroller, a requisition of the Head of the Department issues to the Secretary of the Treasury.

The following are the documents referred to in Mr. Cutts' testimony:

No. 17.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Second Comptroller's Office, Jan. 28, 1828.

SIR: It is the opinion of the President that, inasmuch as Gov. Cass's accounts, and those connected with them, are not in the office, to enable you to make out a statement of your accounts, as required in my letter of the 26th instant, the two former will be dispensed with.

That, in presenting your account for expenses, services, and presents to Indians, from Green Bay, &c. you must designate the amount due under each head, with a particular statement of the amount given to Indians.

Respectfully, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
RICHARD CUTTS.

THOS. L. MCKENNEY, Esq.

January 28, 1828.

To the SECRETARY OF WAR:

SIR: I have received the enclosed note from Mr. Cutts. I am not able, Sir, to decide how much I paid under the several branches, as enumerated in my account. I will not pretend to be particular, even as to the estimate which follows: It is but an *estimate*, and one, too, without data.

I travelled 4,000 miles at least, after leaving Green Bay, and in the execution of your instructions, which are *wholly* separate from all others in which I was connected with Governor Cass, and have no more to do with his accounts than with your own private funds. I had, for about one thousand miles of the way, besides a delay, owing to the rain of weeks, independent of the time I was travelling or voyaging, eleven persons to support, and eight of these to pay; and on entering on the 4th Chickasaw Bluff, I had to procure two horses, a light wagon, (for which I claim the hire, they having been bought on my own account, and sold afterwards on my own account,) and I had to hire guides, Indians and half breeds, and interpreters, and all these to feed and pay; and then come home from the Creek agency with a servant and baggage in the mail stage; a servant having accompanied me the whole way.

I estimate the cost, under these heads, from Green Bay, at one thousand dollars; I have allowed me thirteen hundred and forty-four dollars—rather $1,244; the $100 being added to repay me for so much paid on account of my expenses, since I returned, for my services. These two deducted from $4,532, the total account, would leave $2,188, to have been given away as presents among *three nations of Indians*, besides fragments of four others. So the item will stand thus:

Supposed cost of expenses -	$1,000
Specific allowance for services -	1,344
Leaving for presents - - -	2,188
Total of the account, -	$4,532

As rendered, and now with the Second Comptroller.

THOMAS L. McKENNEY.

No. 2.

WAR DEPARTMENT.

(No. 1,100.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY:

SIR. Please cause a warrant for thirteen hundred and forty-four dollars — cents, to be issued in favor of General John Tipton, per order, for which sum Thomas L. McKenney is to be held accountable; to be charged to undermentioned appropriations.

Given under my hand, this ninth day of January, 1828.

JAMES BARBOUR.
Secretary of War.

1,344 dols. — cts.

Countersigned, ——— ———
Second Comptroller.

Registered, ——— ———
Auditor.

Appropriations.

Contingencies of Indian Department, $1,344

The Chairman submitted the following letter for the adoption of the Committee.

Committee Room of the Select Committee on Retrenchment,

May 1, 1828.

Sir: It having been ascertained, in the course of our examination, that the late Daniel P. Cook, late Representative in Congress, from the State of Illinois, received a sum of money from the Government, during the spring or summer of the last year, for certain services, supposed to have been either foreign or diplomatic, I addressed a note to Joseph Nourse, Esq., Register of the Treasury, of which the following is a copy.

"SIR: With a view of elucidating a subject of inquiry, now before the Select Committee on Retrenchment, I am desirous of knowing whether it appears on any of the books of your office, that a sum of money was paid to the late Daniel P. Cook, formerly representing the State of Illinois, in Congress, since the fourth of March, 1827, and, if any, to what amount, and for what service stated to have been rendered.

J. HAMILTON, *Chairman.*

JOSEPH NOURSE, Esq.,
Register of the Treasury."

In reply to which Mr. Nourse has enclosed me the following certificate.

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Register's Office, April 30, 1828.

I do hereby certify, that from an examination of the books of this office, it does not appear that any money has been paid Daniel P. Cook, formerly representing the State of Illinois, in Congress, from the fourth of March, 1827.

JOSEPH NOURSE, *Register.*"

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*, subject to newspaper postage and *no more*.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, JULY 5, 1828. No. 17.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ADDRESS TO GEN. WASHINGTON.

Messrs. GREEN & JARVIS: The oft repeated tale, that Gen. Jackson voted in 1796 against an address to Gen. Washington, and consequently, that he was ill sentiment and feeling opposed to him, is met by the circumstances disclosed in the enclosed letters, which I desire you will publish at some convenient time. Not long since, I addressed a letter to Mr. Giles, Governor of Virginia, and to Mr. Livingston, a member of Congress from the State of Louisiana; both of them representatives in Congress at the period when this address was proposed for consideration. The replies of those gentlemen satisfactorily show, that the minority vote resulted from no personal objections entertained, but alone from the controling influences of principle. As his acquaintances know, no man in the country entertains, or has manifested, a stronger regard for the character and services of the father of our country, than has General Jackson. Looking to the similarity of, and parallel in their histories, it could hardly be expected to be otherwise; and yet this vote, so very immaterial, when all the circumstances, as disclosed by Mr. Giles and Mr. Livingston, are looked to, and which was given thirty-one years ago, is seized upon, and circulated widely for political effect, that under cover of that sanctity which meritedly attaches itself to the name of Washington, prejudices may be produced. These letters, highly interesting, are forwarded to you for publication, that this perverted objection may be correctly understood.

With great respect.

J. H. EATON.

WASHINGTON, 29th May, 1828.

RICHMOND, May 5, 1828.

DEAR SIR: Your highly esteemed favor of the 1st instant reached me last evening, and I have given the most respectful attention to its contents. After many false, scandalous, malignant, idle, silly, blackguard, ridiculous and preposterous charges heretofore brought against Gen. Jackson by the parasites of the Administration, (excuse this long list of epithets, but the occasion would justify as many more,) I am not at all surprised that the *new one*, of nearly *thirty-one years* standing, mentioned in your letter, should be added to the disgusting catalogue. Many of the most terrific of those charges, seem to me to be too preposterous even for the use an old woman in a nursery; and I am sure would be frowned down by universal consent, were it not for the blind infatuation arising from the extremely excited state of feeling existing in the public mind at this moment. Whilst I pretend to no knowledge of the motives of General Jackson, or any others, inducing the two votes he is now called on to defend, I have the most perfect recollection of my own motives for the same votes. The same, and similar charges have often heretofore been brought against myself, for votes upon the same, and similar subjects, given about the same time. It would require more time than I have now at command, to give a full and comprehensive view of the subjects of your inquiry; and in addition to that consideration, I am now in the very last stage of a painful and feeble existence. To form a correct judgment upon these subjects, it would be necessary for you, Sir, to give a critical attention to the whole of the answer to the President's speech; from which you have presented me only an extract; and you cannot avoid seeing from its whole contour, abundant justification to every Republican member of Congress for voting against it; whilst, under impressions like mine, it would be extremely difficult for ingenuity itself to furnish any one sufficient ground of justification for any one Republican member in voting otherwise. Upon examination, you cannot but observe, Sir, that this answer is a most artful, ingenious, able production for its object. Its author was believed to be the celebrated Fisher Ames; and his great and brilliant genius was never more conspicuously displayed in any literary effort of his whole life, than in drawing this celebrated answer. He had two objects in view. The one, the highest wrought eulogiums upon Gen. Washington, drawn from the richest stores of his fertile mind. The other, to crush his republican political opponents, by the irresistible influence of Gen. Washington's well-earned popularity. The one object was highly laudable; the other, unworthy of him, and of the occasion. The incense to Gen. Washington, upon his retirement from public service, ought to have been pure and unadulterated. It should have consisted solely of the purest love offerings of the heart. It should not have been contaminated by the indulgence of hostile, vindictive passions towards others. Not so thought Mr. Ames, and his party. The occasion was too tempting, the advantage too great, and their own peril too imminent to be given up to a wise, honorable, and liberal course of proceeding. Mr Ames had the whole weight of Gen. Washington's popularity in his hands, and he determined to make the most of it, upon this delicate and interesting occasion. He determined to use it, not only to Washington's honor, but to the dishonor of all his political opponents, and reckless of mercy towards them, he resolved through its potent influence, to compel these daring political opponents to bear testimony themselves to their own dishonor and political inconsistency. I, for one, indignantly repelled this insulting effort, under the peril of the vengeance of Gen. Washington's whole popularity. I disdained to give evidence against my own honor, and my own political consistency; in direct violation of the best dictates of my own judgment and conscience. Mr. Ames might, without difficulty, have obtained an unanimous and hearty vote in favor of his answer, if his sole object had been the plaudits of Gen. Washing-

tion; however highly wrought or extravagant; but this would not content him, nor his party. The humiliation of their political antagonists seemed to be the most acceptable portion of his unhallowed incense. Mr. Ames made the most artful and cutting thrusts at them, which the occasion invited. The most artful and effective of all, will probably be found in the quotation, from which, the clause moved to be stricken out, formed a part. The words the most peculiarly insulting and offensive, in the clause proposed to be stricken out, are these: "*It is our earnest wish*, that your *example* may be the *guide* of your *successors*." Your *example* in what? Certainly in his *Presidential character*, as evidenced *in his practical administration of the government*. Not the example of his military conduct during the Revolutionary war. Not the example of his life, generally. Oh, no; Mr. Ames would not be content, with holding out these examples for imitation; but an *example*, i.e. *that* by which his successors in the *Presidential Office* might be *guided*; of course, the whole of his administration. Now, the republicans, myself with the rest, had not only opposed, but zealously and strenuously opposed, the most prominent measures of Washington's administration. The establishment of the bank of the United States. The British treaty, the funding system, &c. &c. could any thing have been more insulting to every honorable republican opponent of the most prominent measures of Washington's administration, than to be peremptorily called upon to declare to the world, that, *it was his earnest wish*, that Washington's *example in his practical administration of the government, should be the guide for the observance of his successors?* When almost every day's opposition to his measures, incontestibly proved, *he wished no such thing;* or if he did, that his opposition to those same measures, were dishonorable and deceptive? It was not possible for my mind to be *brought* to such a state of humiliation and dishonor; and without fear or apprehension of consequences, supported by an approving conscience, I indignantly repelled the attempted coercion.

It is very far from my desire, or intention, to implicate, in any respect whatever, the motives of those republican members, who voted in favor of this artful, ingenious answer. They doubtlessly took a different view of its meaning, from that I put upon it; and perhaps it may be said in their justification, that the words selected by Mr. Ames, are general in their character and, being ingeniously chosen, might admit of some other interpretation. It may be so: but the words certainly do bear, and were intended to bear, the interpretation I then put upon them; and the mere possibility that they could be even tortured to bear that interpretation, would certainly be sufficient for my justification, in repelling them with indignation. The possibility of their being tortured to bear some different meaning, affords no mental salvo to me. The charge then is reduced to this; that an insulting attempt, under an ingenious disguise, was made to coerce me to bear testimony against my own honor, and my own political consistency, at the hazard of encountering the dread influence of Washington's popularity; and that I had firmness and independence enough, to resist that influence: and save my own honor. This is the head and front of the offence, and I presume of General Jackson's. If this be guilt, I rejoice in its commission—and this too, after thirty-one years of cool reflection, under the sanction of an approving conscience; and I now wish it to be distinctly understood that, whilst I never did at any time set up the least pretensions to services, like Washington's, and was at all times disposed to render him as pure homage for those services, as any citizen of the United States, I did not then, nor did I ever, yield to Washington, nor any other human being, in claims to honorable motives, and purity of intentions. Besides, my conduct at that day was universally known in the district I then had the honor to represent, and universally approved. My responsibility for all these evil deeds, has been since tested in my elections by the people; by the Executive Council; and by the Legislature. During which time, I never solicited an office, nor a vote for an office; nor did I, until lately, ever lose an election. Since that time a new set of politicians have grown up, under the magical influence of a splendid Government, without any of the feelings inspired by the great republican principles of the revolution, or of the republican feelings of the time of Washington's administration; who are now calling the *old* republicans to a *new* account, upon a very different test of responsibility from that which in those times was deemed the true test of political merit; and who, under this infatuation, inspired by the brilliant delusive prospects of a splendid Government, have already, as I think, substituted the most frightful destructive despotism, for the best and happiest republican system ever devised for the benefit of man; and which, for nearly half a century, proved its great merit, in the blessings it conferred upon the American people. It will afford me much pleasure, Sir, if the foregoing explanation should enable you to defend General Jackson against these *new* charges for *old* sins; and you are at liberty to make any use of them you please, for that purpose; but I really fear, that the trouble I have imposed upon you, of reading so long a letter, will cause you to regret the call you have made upon me for the explanation.

Be pleased, Sir, to accept assurances of my respectful and friendly considerations, &c.

WM. B. GILES.

The Hon. J. H. Eaton.

Washington City, 21st May, 1828.

Dear Sir—To answer your inquiries "what were the causes of my vote against the address to the President in 1796, and particularly whether that vote proceeded from any feeling of disapprobation or personal dislike to Gen. Washington," it will be necessary to advert to circumstances at, and events prior to the time that vote was given.

Any one at all conversant with the political history of our country, knows that very soon after the federal constitution was established, two parties arose, nearly equal in numbers, and regarding each other with great jealousy. The federal party had the government in their hands, and they had the inappreciable advantage of seeing raised to the head of it, by the unanimous voice of the nation, a man honored by their political opponents as the father of his country, which had been preserved by his virtue, brave-

ty, and prudence; whose name alone, they thought, would sanctify, and whose reputation would give success to all their measures. The republican members of the House of Representatives, (I use the names which then distinguished the parties,) thought that one, in particular, of those measures, were injurious to the best interests of the country, and without, in any instance that I remember, forgetting the sentiments of respect, gratitude, and high admiration, which were due to General Washington, they opposed that measure of his administration. They believed that it would have been a dereliction of duty, to give up the independent expression of their opinion, because it was contrary to measures sanctioned by a name they revered—and conscious of the weight of that name, I may perhaps be permitted to say, that there was some degree of merit in stemming the tide of popularity which was attached to it.

Of the measures to which I have alluded, it is necessary, for the present purpose, only to single out one. The mission of Mr. Jay to Great Britain, and its consequences, the treaty of 1795, and the refusal to comply with the request of the House of Representatives, for the inspection of the papers which led to the formation of that treaty.

That the Chief Justice of the United States should be taken from his duties, and put on a foreign mission, without resigning his judicial appointment, was deemed unwise, if not contrary to the spirit of the constitution.

The treaty itself, in its stipulations and omissions, was considered as derogatory to our honor, and injurious to our interests.

After it was ratified, when the appropriations and laws were to be made for carrying it into effect, the House made a respectful request to the President, that, if existing negotiations did not render it improper, he would communicate to the House the papers in relation to the said treaty. This request was refused, and the denial was grounded on a denial of the Constitutional power of the House to exercise their discretion in carrying the Treaty into effect. On this refusal, the House passed a resolution, which asserted the right that the President had denied.

These subjects created great excitement, both in debate and in the public mind, and the just veneration in which Washington was held, created an effect somewhat similar to the maxim of the English Constitutional law. All these measures were attributed to the President's advisers. It was known that the heads of Departments, which, by the Constitution, were to be consulted, each on the affairs of his separate Department, were formed into a Cabinet council, and gave their opinions on all the important concerns of the government. It was supposed, (I do not vouch for the truth of the supposition,) but it was generally supposed, that the President was guided by the opinions of a majority of this Council. Hence the official acts of the President came to be considered as those of his Cabinet, and were generally termed the acts of *the administration*, and they were opposed when it was thought necessary, and canvassed, and freely spoken of in debate, without any hostility being intended or supposed to the President. Indeed, several of those most prominent in opposition to acts of the Administration, were men for whom Washington had the highest esteem, and who were among those who most revered and admired him.

The treaty question, to which I have alluded, took place in the first session of the fourth Congress, the seventh year of Gen. Washington's Presidency. On the opening of the second session of the same Congress, he alluded in affecting terms to his approaching retirement from office, which he had before announced. I can solemnly say, for myself, that, on this occasion, so far from any ill feeling towards the President, none among those who arrogated to themselves the title of his exclusive friends, could feel more sincerely, or were more disposed to express every sentiment of gratitude for his services, admiration for his character, or wishes for his happiness, than I was. These were ideas that had grown up with me from my childhood: I had never heard the name of Washington pronounced but with veneration by those near relatives who were engaged with him in the same perilous struggle. Independence, Liberty and Victory were associated with it in my mind, and the awful admiration with which I was struck, when (yet a boy) I was first admitted to his presence, yielded only to the more rational sentiments of gratitude and national pride, when at a maturer age, I could appreciate his services, and estimate the honor his virtues and character had conferred upon his country. I had seen him in the hour of peril, when the contest was doubtful, and his life and reputation, as well as the liberties of the nation, depended on the issue. I had seen him in the moment of triumph, when the surrender of an hostile army had secured our independence. My admiration followed him in his first retreat, and was not lessened by his quitting it to give the aid of his name and influence to the union of the States under an efficient Government—in addition to this, he had received me with kindness in my youth, and without having it in my power to boast of any particular intimacy, circumstances had thrown me very frequently in the way of receiving from him such attentions as indicated some degree of regard.

With these motives for joining in the most energetic expressions of admiration and gratitude—with a heart filled with sentiments of veneration, and desirous of recording them, my concern can scarcely be imagined, when I found that I must be debarred from joining my voice to those of my fellow citizens in expressing these feelings, unless in the same breath I should pronounce a disavowal of principles, which I then thought, and still think, were well founded, and declared that I approved that which I had but just solemnly, not only pronounced, but recorded to be, in my opinion, improper and injurious to the interest of my constituents. It was in vain that I and others entreated that the objectionable passages might be struck out—in vain we offered to insert others more expressive of personal respect for the President—they were a majority, they were obdurate. The address was ably and skilfully drawn, and without this spirit of investigation, which party generally excites, the objectionable passages might have escaped attention—but when discovered and considered, they could, in my opinion, bear no other construction than that which I have indicated. To judge of this, Sir, you must have the address before you. I trust

scribe, therefore, so much as relates to the subject of your inquiry. The beginning, which related chiefly to our foreign relations, contained some passages which did not meet the entire approbation of the House, but they were amended in Committee; the residue was in the following words.

"When we advert to the internal situation of the United States, we deem it equally natural and becoming to compare the tranquil prosperity of the citizens with the period immediately antecedent to the operation of the government, and to contrast it with the calamities in which the state of war still involves several of the European nations, as the reflections, deduced from both tend to justify, as well as to excite, a warmer admiration of our free constitution, and to exalt our minds to a more fervent and grateful sense of piety towards Almighty God, for the beneficence of his providence, by which its administration has been hitherto so remarkably distinguished.

"And while we entertain a grateful conviction that *your wise, firm and patriotic administration* has been signally conducive to the success of the present form of Government, we cannot forbear to express the deep sensations of regret, with which we contemplate your intended retirement from office.

"As no other suitable occasion may occur, we cannot suffer the present to pass without attempting to disclose some of the emotions which it cannot fail to awaken.

"The gratitude and admiration of your countrymen, are still drawn to the recollection of those resplendent virtues and talents, which were so eminently instrumental to the achievement of the revolution, and of which that glorious event will ever be the memorial. Your obedience to the voice of duty and your country, when you quitted reluctantly, a second time, the retreat you had chosen, and first accepted the Presidency, afforded a new proof of the devotedness of your zeal in its service, and an earnest of the patriotism and success which have characterized your administration. As the grateful confidence of the citizens in the virtues of their chief magistrate, has essentially contributed to that success, we persuade ourselves, that the millions whom we represent, participate with us in the anxious solicitude of the present occasion.

"Yet we cannot be unmindful, that your moderation and magnanimity, twice displayed by retiring from your exalted stations, afford examples no less rare and instructive to mankind, than valuable to a republic.

"Although we are sensible that this event, of itself, completes the lustre of a character already conspicuously unrivalled by the coincidence of virtue, talents, success, and public estimation; yet we conceive we owe it to you, Sir, and still more emphatically to ourselves and to our nation, (of the language of whose hearts we presume to think ourselves at this moment the faithful interpreters,) to express the sentiments with which it is contemplated.

"The spectacle of a whole nation, the freest and most enlightened in the world, offering by its representatives the tribute of unfeigned approbation to its first citizen, however novel and interesting it may be, derives all its lustre, (a lustre which accident or enthusiasm could not bestow, and which adulation would tarnish) from the transcendant merit of which it is the voluntary testimony.

"May you long enjoy that liberty which is so dear to you, and to which your name will ever be so dear: may your own virtues and a nation's prayers, obtain the happiest sunshine for the decline of your days, and the choicest of future blessings. For your country's sake, for the sake of republican liberty, it is our earnest wish that your example may be the guide of your successors, and thus, after being the ornament and safeguard of the present age, become the patrimony of our descendants."

In the very imperfect sketches of the debates of that time, I find that all my remarks in its different stages show, as well my desire to coincide with the greatest admirers of Washington, as my sincere desire to produce such amendments as would allow me to vote for the address. (p. 68 Carpenter's Debates) "Mr. Livingston was sorry the answer was not drawn so as to avoid this debate—he said it was his sincere desire and hope, that, gentlemen who advocated this address in the present form, and those who wished to amend it, would so combine as to make it agreeable to all," he said he intended to vote against the amendment, (to strike out the last eight paragraphs,) and with a view to reconcile parties, when this motion was disposed of, he would move to strike out some words and insert others—(p. 90.) "Mr. Livingston moved to strike out the words "*tranquil prosperity, with the period,*" and insert "*present period with that*—"he could not say that this was a time of tranquil prosperity; were he to say so, he should mock the distresses of his constituents, which were evident—trade was on the decline, commerce ruined, embarrassments which contradict the assertion, existed; but he could not think our misery equal to that of the nations of Europe, who were involved in war; he thought, therefore, that the language of the address might be retained, as drawing consolation from that comparison, although ours is not a state of perfect tranquillity and prosperity; he thought too there was an inaccuracy of language in comparing *tranquil prosperity* to a *period*—tranquillity could not be compared with a *period of time.* He hoped that, notwithstanding the tenacity of adherence to words, that all might agree in the address: *he would be extremely hurt, could he conceive that we differed in sentiments of gratitude and admiration for that great man; but while he was desirous to express this, he could not do it at the expense of his feelings or principles. The former he might sacrifice, but the latter he could not to any man.*"

This amendment was agreed to—42 to 37.

I invite your particular attention Sir, to the phrase which I next proposed to alter; you will see that it applies to the *administration*, the epithets, *wise, firm* and *patriotic.* You will bear in mind what was then generally understood by the term administration; you well remember that I, and those with whom I acted, had but the preceding session, denounced one of its leading measures as deserving the very reverse of these characteristics, and you will then determine whether we could, with any consistency, vote for the address, while it contained this sentence. To show, however, that while we could not say that the measures of the Cabinet were wise, firm and patriotic, we were perfectly willing to

ascribe these qualities to the President. I moved to strike out the words "wise, firm and patriotic administration," and insert "your wisdom, firmness, and patriotism." In moving this, (the Register says) "Mr. Livingston could not say that all the acts of the administration had been wise and firm, but he would say that he believed the wisdom, firmness and patriotism of the President, had been signally conducive to the success of the present form of government." This amendment was not agreed to, and the consequence was that, we must either vote for the address containing this stigma on our own conduct, or not vote for it at all. In the House, one other amendment was moved—to strike out the concluding paragraph which contained a prayer that the example of the President, that is, as we construed it, the example of the public measures his administration had adopted, might guide *his successors;* the word *successors* clearly indicating that it was the example of the measures of his administration that we proposed as a model for those of future Presidents; and yet we had opposed the most prominent of those measures: this was also refused by a vote of 54 to 24. No man who has a regard for consistency can say that putting this construction on those parts of the address thus retained we could vote for it. No candid man can say that they will not at least bear such construction, and no one who considers the tenacity with which they were retained, can doubt that the federal majority intended to reduce us to the dilemma of being considered as unfriendly to the fame of the man whom we revered as much as they did, or of signing our own disgrace.

Now, Sir, I pray you to examine the address; see what I was willing to assent to, and peruse it as it would have been if the few expressions to which I objected had been changed or stricken out; and then, for yourself, answer the question propounded in your note "whether any improper feeling towards Gen. Washington, prompted my negative vote to the address."

I have spoken chiefly of my own sentiments and feelings: I could with no propriety identify them with those of others; but I am bound to say, that I believe I entertained them in common with most of the members who voted with me. In that list, are names with which I shall ever be proud to see mine associated. The person to whom you have particularly alluded, could not but have participated in the high admiration I felt for the man, who, in that age, as he himself has done in his own, "filled the measure of his country's glory:" he must have received in his congenial mind, the spark from that bright example, which has animated him so successfully to emulate the military glory of the hero, who saved his country, and has fitted him to become a worthy successor to the first, and greatest President of the United States. In that list was the venerable Macon, whose mind is as incapable of envy, as his incorruptible integrity is of injustice. In it will be found other names, of men who cannot, from the uniform tenor of their lives, and their attachment to the liberties of their country, be for a moment suspected of ingratitude to its deliverer. I strive not, however, to shelter myself under their sanction: the votes I gave, were the deliberate result of my best judgment, the sentiments and reasons by which I supported them, were, the dictates of honest conviction, and could the same circumstances again present themselves, I should pursue the same conduct. In justifying my own motives, I do not presume to arraign those of others. Men for whom I have the highest esteem, voted for the amendments, and afterwards for the Address; they did it doubtless from conviction: one of the most distinguished of them is stated in the debate to have said, that although he had at first considered the objectionable parts in the light that I did, yet after much hesitation, he brought himself to the conclusion, that they did not go so far as at first he thought they did, and that, *had they approved of every measure of the President, he would have voted against them.* I thought they did: I knew that whether they did or not, that construction would be put upon them by our political enemies, and I even believed that they had been introduced with that very view; I therefore could not vote as he did. There is one fact to which I must allude, showing conclusively that this charge of hostility to Washington—disbelieved or misunderstood even by those who made it, was not credited by the men of all others best conversant of the fact, and most interested in defending his reputation.

The Society of Cincinnati, in the State of New York, some years ago elected General Jackson an honorary member: On the fourth of July last, they did me the same honor by a unanimous vote. Would the venerable remnants of the friends and companions of Washington, associated under his auspices for the purpose of cherishing the friendships contracted during the contest which he so gloriously conducted, and watching over his fame so inseparably connected with their own—would they have conferred this distinction on two men who had, at any one period of their lives, shown themselves his enemies or detractors. This fact alone, Sir, is an answer to your inquiries, and as regards myself, is the more conclusive, because at the time the votes in question were given, I had the honor to represent the City of New-York in Congress, and my constituents could neither be ignorant of my measures, nor unacquainted with my motives. I may add too, that immediately after this transaction, I was re-elected by an increased majority.

I have found it impossible, Sir, to answer your queries without going into a detail which I fear you may think prolix, but the transaction is so remote, that circumstances familiar at the time, and which then it would have been useless to detail, are now necessarily introduced into the statement, and I sum up the whole by saying explicitly, that I never refused my assent to a vote of thanks and an expression of gratitude and respect to Washington—on the contrary, I repeatedly expressed my desire to join in an address that should testify it in the strongest terms.

I am, with great respect,
Your most ob't. serv't,
EWD. LIVINGSTON

The Hon. John H. Eaton.

"*Sign*" *in Boston.*—The democratic friends of Andrew Jackson, celebrated the late 4th of July, by a public dinner, and an Oration in Boston.

From the National Intelligencer 25th May, 1811.

Extract from Mr. Clay's speech in the Senate U. S. against the bill to renew the charter of the Bank of the U. S.

"It has been said by the Hon. gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Crawford,) that this has been made a party question, although the law incorporating the Bank was passed prior to the formation of parties and when Congress was not biassed by party prejudices (Mr. Crawford explained.) He did not mean that it had been made a party question in the Senate. His allusion was elsewhere. I do not think it altogether fair to refer to the discussions in the H. of Representatives, as gentlemen belonging to that body, have no opportunity of defending themselves here. It is true that this law was not the effect, but it is no less true that it was one of the causes of the political divisions in this country, and if during the agitation of the present question the renewal has on one side been opposed on party principles, let me ask, if on the other it has not been advocated on similar principles? Where is the Macedonian phalanx, the opposition in Congress? I believe Sir, I shall not incur the charge of presumptions prophecy when I predict that we shall not pick up from its ranks one single straggler! and if on this occasion my worthy friend from Georgia, has gone over into the camp of the enemy, is it kind in him to look back upon his former friends and rebuke them for the fidelity with which they adhere to their old principles?

I shall not stop to examine how far a Representative is bound by the instructions of his constituents. That is a question between the giver and receiver of the instructions. But I must be permitted to express my surprise at the pointed difference which has been made between the opinions and instructions of State Legislatures, and the opinions and details of the deputations, with which we have been surrounded from Philadelphia. Whilst the resolutions of those Legislatures, known legitimate, constitutional, and deliberative bodies, have been thrown into the back ground and their interference regarded as officious, these delegations from self created societies, composed of whom nobody knows, have been received by the Committee with the utmost complaisance.

Their communications have been treasured up with the greatest diligence. Never did the Delphic priests collect with more holy care the frantic expressions of the agitated Pythia or expound them with more solemnity to the astonished Grecians, than has the Committee gathered the opinions and testimony of these deputies and though the gentleman from Massachusetts, pompously detailed them to the Senate! Philadelphia has her immediate representatives capable of expressing her wishes upon the floor of the other House. If it be improper for States to obtrude upon Congress their sentiments, it is much more highly so for the unauthorised deputies of fortuitous congregations.

The first singular feature that attaets attention in this bill, is the new and unconstitutional veto which it establishes. The constitution has required only that after bills have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, they shall be presented to the President for his approval or rejection, and his determination is to be made known in 10 days. But this bill provides that when all the constitutional sanctions are obtained, and when according to the usual routine of legislation, it ought to be considered as a law, it is to be submitted to a new branch of the legislate, consisting of the President and 24 Directors of the Bank of the United States holding their sesions in Philadelphia, and if they please to approve it, why then, it is to become a law. And three months, (the term allowed by our law of May last, to one of the great belligerents, for invoking his edicts after the other shall have repealed his) are granted them to decide whether an act of Congress shall be the law of the land or not! An act which is said to be indispensably necessary to our salvation, and without the passage of which universal distress and bankruptcy are to pervade the country. Remember, Sir, that the honorable gentleman from Georgia has contended that this charter is no contract. Does it, then, become the representatives of the nation to leave the nation at the mercy of a corporation? Ought the impending calamities to be left at the hazard of a contingent remedy?

This vagrant power to erect a Bank after having wandered throughout the whole constitution in quest of some congenial spot wherein to fasten, has been located by the Gentleman from Georgia on that provision which authorizes Congress to lay and collect taxes, &c. In 1791, the power is referred to one part of the instrument. In 1811, to another. Sometimes it is alleged to be deducible from the power to regulate Commerce Hard pressed, here it disappears, and shows itself under the grant to coin money. The sagacious Secretary of the Treasury in 1791 pursued the wisest course—he has taken shelter behind general high sounding and imposing terms. He has declared in the preamble to the act establishing the Bank, that it will be very *conducive* to the successful *conducting* of the national *finances*; will *tend* to give *facility* to the obtaining of loans, and will be *productive* of considerable advantage to *trade* and *industry* in general! No allusion is made to the collection of taxes. What is the nature of this government? It is emphatically Federal, vested with an aggregate of specified powers for general purposes conceded by existing sovereignties who have themselves retained what is not so conceded. It is said that there are cases in which it must act on implied powers. This is not controverted, but the implication must be necessary, and obviously flow from the enumerated power with which it is allied. The power to charter companies is not specified in the grant, and I contend is of a nature not transferable by mere implication. It is one of the most exalted attributes of sovereignty. In the exercise of this gigantic power we have seen an East India Company created which has carried dismay, desolation, and death, throughout one of the largest portions of the habitable world. A company which is in itself a sovereignty—which has subverted empires, and set up new dynasties—and has not only made war, but war against its legitimate sovereign. Under the influence of this power we have seen arise a South sea Company, and a Mississippi Company, that distracted and convulsed all Europe and menaced a total overthrow of all credit and con

ndence and universal bankruptcy. Is it to be imagined that a power so vast would have been left by the wisdom of the Constitution to doubtful inference? It has been alleged that there are many instances in the Constitution where powers in their nature incidental, and which would have necessarily vested along with the principal power are nevertheless expressly enumerated; and the power "to make rules and regulations for the government of the land and naval forces," which it is said is incidental to the power to raise armies and to provide a navy, is given as an example. What does this this prove? How extremely cautious the convention were to leave as little as possible to implication. In all cases where incidental powers are acted upon, the principal and incidental ought to be congenial with each other, and partake of a common nature. The incidental power ought to be strictly subordinate and limited to the end proposed to be attained by the specified power. In other words, under the name of accomplishing one object which is specified the power implied ought not to be made to embrace other objects which are not specified in the Constitution. If, then, you could establish a bank to collect and distribute the revenue, it ought to be expressly restricted to the purpose of such collection and distribution. It is mockery, worse than usurpation, to establish it for a lawful object, and then extend it to other objects which are not lawful. In deducing the power to create corporations, such as I have described it from the power to collect taxes, the relation and condition of principal and incident are prostrated and destoyed. The accessory is exalted above the principal. As well might it be said that the great luminary of day is an accessory, a sattelite, to the humblest star that twinkles forth its feeble light in the firmament of Heaven

Suppose the Constitution had been silent as to an individual Department of this Government, could you under the power to lay and collect taxes, establish a judiciary? I presume not; but if you could derive the power by mere implication—could you vest it with any other authority, than to enforce the collection of the revenue? A Bank is made for the ostensible purpose of aiding in the collection of the revenue, and whilst it is engaged in this, the most inferior and subordinate of all its functions, it is made to diffuse itself throughout society, and to influence all the great objects of credit, circulation and commerce. Like the Virginia Justice, you tell the man whose turkey had been stolen, that your book of precedents, furnishes no form for his case, but then you will grant him a precept, to search for a cow, and when looking for that, he may possibly find his turkey. You say to this corporation, we cannot authorize you to discount, to emit paper, to regulate commerce, &c. No! Our book has no precedents of that kind. But then we can authorize you to collect the revenue, and whilst occupied with that, you may do whatever else you please.

What is a corporation such as the bill contemplates? It is a splendid association of favored individuals, taken from the mass of society, and invested with exemptions, and surrounded by immunities and privileges. The honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Lloyd,) has said, that the original law establishing the Bank, was justly liable to the objection of vesting in that institution, an exclusive privilege, the faith of the Government being pledged that no other Bank should be authorized during its existence. This objection, he supposes, is obviated by the bill under consideration; but all corporations enjoy exclusive privileges—that is, the corporators have privileges, which no others possess; and if you create fifty corporations, instead of one, you have only fifty privileged bodies, instead of one. I contend that the States have the exclusive power to regulate contracts, to declare the capacities and incapacities to contract, and to provide as to the extent of responsibility of debtors to their creditors. If Congress have the power to erect an artificial body, and say it shall be endowed with the attributes of an individual—if you can bestow on this object of your own creation, the ability to contract, may you not in contravention of State rights, confer upon slaves, infants, and femes covert, the ability to contract? And if you have the power to say, that an association of individuals shall be responsible for their debts, only in a certain limited degree, what is to prevent an extension of a similar exemption, to individuals? Where is the limitation upon this power to set up corporations? You establish one in the heart of a State, the basis of whose capital is money. You may erect others, whose capital shall consist of land, slaves, and personal estate, and thus the whole property within the jurisdiction of a State, might be absorbed by these political bodies. The existing Bank, contends that it is beyond the power of a State to tax it, and if this pretension be well founded, it is in the power of Congress, by chartering companies, to dry up the whole of the sources of State revenue. Georgia has undertaken, it is true, to levy a tax on the Branch within her jurisdiction, but this law, now under a course of litigation, is considered as invalid. The United States own a great deal of land in the State of Ohio. Can this Government for the purpose of creating an ability to purchase it, charter a company? Aliens are forbidden, I believe in that State, to hold real estate. Could you, in order to multiply purchasers, confer upon them the capacity to hold land in derogation of the local law? Imagine this will hardly be insisted upon; and yet there exists a more obvious connection between the undoubted power which is possessed by this Government to sell its land, and the means of executing that power, by increasing the demand in the market, than there is between this Bank, and the collection of a tax. This Government has the power to levy taxes—to raise armies—provide a navy—make war—regulate commerce—coin money, &c. &c. It would not be difficult to show as intimate a connexion between a corporation, established for any purpose whatever, and some one or other of those great powers, as there is between the revenue and the Bank of the United States.

Let us enquire into the actual participation of this Bank, in the collection of the revenue. Prior to the passage of the act of 1800, requiring the collectors of those ports of entry, at which the principal Bank, or any of the offices are situated, to deposit with them the custom house bonds, it had not the smallest agency in the collection of duties. During almost one moiety of the period, to which the existence of

this institution was limited, it was no ways instrumental in the collection of that revenue, to which it is now become indispensable. The collection previous to 1800, was made entirely by the collectors; and even at present, where there is one port of entry, at which this Bank is employed, there are eight or ten, at which the collection is made, as it was before 1800. And, Sir, what does the Bank or its Branches, when resort is had to it? It does not adjust with the merchant, the amount of the duty, nor take his bond; nor if the bond is not paid, coerce the payment by distress or otherwise. In fact, it has no active agency, whatever is the collection. Its operation is merely passive; that is, if the obliger, after his bond is placed in the Bank, discharges it all, is very well. Such is the mighty aid afforded by this tax gatherer, without which, the Government cannot get along. Again, it is not pretended, that the very limited assistance which this institution does in truth render, extends to any other than a single species of tax, that is, duties. In the collection of the excise, the direct and other internal taxes, no aid was derived from any bank. It is true, in the collection of those taxes, the farmer did not obtain the same indulgence which the merchant receives in paying duties. But what obliges Congress to give credit at all. Could it not demand prompt payment of the duties? And in fact does it not so demand in many instances.—Whether credit is given or not, is a matter of mere discretion. If it be a facility to mercantile operations, (as I presume it is,) it ought to be granted. But I deny the right to ingraft upon it a bank which you would not otherwise have the power to erect. You cannot *create the necessity* of a bank, and then plead *that necessity* for its establishment. In the administration of the finances, the bank acts simply as a payer and receiver. The Secretary of the Treasury has money in New-York and wants it in Charleston; the bank will furnish him with a check or bill to make the remittance, which any merchant would do just as well.

I will now proceed to show by fact, actual experience, not theoretic reasoning, but by the records themselves, of the Treasury, that the operations of that Department may be as well conducted without, as with this bank. The delusion has consisted in the use of certain high sounding phrases dextrously used on the occasion. "The collection of the revenue"—"the administration of finance"—"the conducting of the fiscal affairs of the government," the usual language of the advocates of the bank, extort, express assent, or awe into acquiescence, without inquiry or examination into its necessity. About the commencement of this year, there appears by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the 7th of January, to have been a little upwards of two millions and four hundred thousand dollars in the Treasury of the United States; and more than one-third of this whole sum was in the vaults of the local banks. In several instances where an opportunity existed of selecting the bank, a preference has been given to the State Bank, or at least a portion of the deposits has been made with it. In New York, for example, there was deposited with the Manhattan Bank $188,670, although a Branch Bank is in that city. In this District $115,089 were deposited with the Bank of Columbia, although here also is a Branch Bank, and yet the State Banks are utterly unsafe to be trusted! If the money after the bonds are collected, is thus placed with these banks, I presume there can be no difficulty in placing the bonds themselves there, if they must be deposited with some bank for collection, which I deny.

Again: one of the most important and complicated branches of the Treasury Department is the management of our landed system. The sales have some years amounted to upwards of half a million of dollars, are generally made upon credit, and yet no bank whatever is made use of to facilitate the collection. After it is made, the amount in some instances, has been deposited with banks, and according to the Secretary's report, which I have before adverted to, the amount so deposited, was in January, upwards of $300,000, not one cent of which was in the vaults of the Bank of the United States, or in any of its branches; but in the Bank of Pennsylvania, its Branch at Pittsburg, the Marietta Bank, and the Kentucky Bank. Upon the point of responsibility, I cannot subscribe to the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, if it is meant that the ability to pay the amount of any deposites which the government may make under any exigency is greater than that of the State Banks; that the *accountability* of a ramified institution, whose affairs are managed by a single head, responsible for all its members, is more simple than that of a number of independent and unconnected establishments, I shall not deny; but with regard to safety, I am strongly inclined to think it is on the side of the local banks. The corruption or misconduct of the parent, or any of its branches, may bankrupt and destroy the whole system, and the loss of the Government, in that event will be of the deposits made with each, whereas in the failure of one State Bank, the loss will be confined to the deposit in the vaults of that Bank. It is said to have been a part of Burrs plan to seize on the Branch Bank at New Orleans. At that period large sums imported from the La Vera Cruz are alleged to have been deposited with it, and if the traitor had accomplished his design, the Bank of the United States if not actually bankrupt, might have been constrained to stop payment.

It is urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Lloyd,) that as this nation progresses in commerce, wealth, and population, new energies will be unfolded, new wants and exigencies will arise, and hence he infers that powers must be implied from the Constitution. But, Sir, the question is, shall we stretch the instrument to embrace cases not fairly within its scope, or shall we resort to that remedy by amendment which the Constitution prescribes?

Gentlemen contend that the construction which they give to the Constitution has been acquiesced in by all parties and under all administrations; and they rely particularly on an act which passed in 1804, for extending a branch to New Orleans and another act of 1807, for punishing those who should forge or utter forged paper of the Bank. With regard to the first law passed no doubt, upon the recommendation of the Treasury Department, I would remark that it was the extension of a branch to a territory, over which Congress possesses power

of legislation almost uncontrolled, and where without any constitutional impediment, charters of incorporation may be granted. As to the other act, it was passed no less for the benefit of the community than the Bank—to protect the ignorant and unwary from counterfeit paper purporting to have been emitted by the Bank. When gentlemen are claiming the advantage supposed to be deducible from acquiescence, let me enquire what they would have had those to have done who believed the establishment of the Bank an encroachment upon State rights? Were they to have resisted and how? By force? Upon the change of parties in 1800 it must be well recollected that the greatest calamities were predicted, as consequences of that event. Intentions were ascribed to the new occupants of power of violating the public faith and prostrating national credit. Under such circumstances, that they should act with great circumspection was quite natural. They saw in full operation a Bank, chartered by a Congress who had as much right to judge of their constitutional powers as their successors. Had they revoked the law which gave its existence, the institution would in all probability have continued to transact business notwithstanding. The judiciary would have been appealed to, and from the known opinions, and predilections of the Judges then composing it, they would have pronounced the act of incorporation as in the nature of a contract, beyond the repealing power of any succeeding legislature. And Sir, what a scene of confusion would such a state of things have presented—an act of Congress which was law in the statute Book, and a nullity on the Judicial records. Was it not wisest to wait the natural dissolution of the corporation, rather than accelerate that event by a repealing law involving so many delicate considerations.

When gentlemen attempt to carry this measure upon the ground of acquiescence, or precedent, do they forget that we are not in Westminster Hall? In courts of justice, the utility of uniformity of decision exacts of the Judge a conformity to the adjudication of his predecessor. In the interpretation and administration of the law this practise is wise and proper, and without it every thing depending upon the caprice of the Judge, we should have no security for our dearest rights. It is far otherwise when applied to the source of legislation. Here no rule exists but the Constitution, and to legislate upon that ground, merely that our predecessors thought themselves authorised under similar circumstances to legislate, is to sanctify error and perpetuate usurpation. But if we are to be subjected to the trammels of precedents, I claim on the other hand the benefit of the restrictions under which the intelligent Judge cautiously receives them. It is an established rule, that to give to a previous adjudication any effect, the mind of the Judge who pronounced it must have been awakened to the subject, and it must have been a deliberate opinion, formed after full argument. In technical language, it must not have been *sub silentio*. Now the act of 1804 and 1807, relied upon as pledges for the rechartering this Company, passed, not only without any discussions whatever, of the Constitutional power of Congress, to establish a Bank, but I venture to say without a single member having had his attention drawn to this question. I had the honor of a seat in the Senate when the latter law passed, probably voted for it, and I declare with the utmost sincerity that I never once thought of that point, and I appeal confidently to every honorable member who was then present to say, if that was not his situation.

This doctrine of precedents applied to the Legislature appears to me, to be fraught with the most mischievous consequences. The great advantage of our system of government over all others, is that we have a *written* Constitution defining its limits, and proscribing its authorities; and that however far a time faction may convulse the nation, and passion and party prejudice sway its functionaries, the season of reflection will recur, when calmly retracing their deeds, all aberrations from fundamental principle will be corrected. But once substitute *practice* for principle—the expositions of the constitution for the text of the constitution, and in vain shall we look for the instrument itself! It will be as diffused and intangible as the pretended Constitution of England. And it must be sought for in the Statute Book, in the fugitive Journals of Congress, and in the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury. What would be our condition, if we were to take the interpretations given to that sacred book, which is or ought to be the criterion of our faith, for the book itself? We should find the Holy Bible, buried beneath the interpretations, glosses, and comments of councils, synods and learned divines, which have produced swarms of intolerant and furious sects, partaking less of the mildness and meekness of their origin, than of a vindictive spirit of hostility towards each other. They ought to afford us a solemn warning, to make that Constitution, which we have sworn to support, our invariable guide.

I conceive, then Sir, that we are not empowered by the Constitution, nor bound by any practice under it, to renew the charter of this Bank, and I might here rest the argument. But as there are strong objections to the renewal, upon the score of expediency, and as the distresses which will attend the dissolution of the Bank, have been greatly exaggerated, I will ask your indulgence for a few moments longer. That some temporary inconvenience will arise, I shall not deny; but most groundlessly have the recent failures in New York been attributed to a discontinuance of this Bank. As well might you ascribe to that cause, the failures at Amsterdam and Hamburgh, of London and Liverpool. The embarrassments of commerce—the sequestration in France—the Danish captures—in fine, the belligerent edicts are the obvious sources of these failures. Their immediate cause is the return of bills upon London, drawn upon the faith of unproductive or unprofitable shipments. Yes, Sir, the protests of the notaries of London, not those of New York, have occasioned these bankruptcies.

The power of a nation is said to consist in the sword and the purse. Perhaps, at last, all power is resolvable into that of the purse, for with it you may command almost every thing else. The specie circulation of the United States is estimated by some calculators at ten millions of dollars: and if it be no more, one moiety is in the vaults of this bank. May not the time arrive when the concentration of such a vast por-

tion of the circulating medium of the country in the hands of any corporation will be dangerous to our liberties? By whom is this immense power wielded? By a body who in derogation of the great principle of all our institutions, responsibility to the people, is amenable only to a few stockholders, and they chiefly foreigners. Suppose an attempt to subvert this government —would not the traiter first aim by force or corruption to acquire the Treasure of this Company? Look at it in another aspect. Seven-tenths of its capital are in the hands of foreigners, and these foreigners chiefly English subjects. We are possibly upon the eve of a rupture with that nation. Should such an event occur, do you apprehend that the English premier would experience any difficulty in obtaining the entire control of this institution!

Republics above all other nations, ought most studiously to guard against foreign influence. All history proves that the internal dissentions excited by foreign intrigue have produced the downfall of almost every free government that has hitherto existed: and yet, gentlemen contend that we are benefitted by the possession of this foreign capital! If we could have its use without its attending abuse, I should be gratified also But it is in vain to expect the one without the other. Wealth is power, and under whatsoever form it exists, its proprietor, whether he lives on this or the other side of the Atlantic, will have a proportionate influence. It is argued, that our possession of this English capital, gives us a certain influence over the British Government. If this reasoning be sound, we had better revoke the interdiction as to aliens holding land, and invite foreigners to engross the whole property real and personal of the country. We had better at once exchange the condition of independent proprietors for that of stewards. We should then be able to govern foreign nations, according to the arguments of gentlemen on the other side. But let us put aside this theory, and appeal to the decisions of experience Go to the other side of the Atlantic, and see what has been achieved for us there by Englishmen holding seven-tenths of the capital of this bank. Has it released from galling and ignominious bondage one solitary American seaman, bleeding under British oppression? Did it prevent the unmanly attack upon the Chesapeake? Did it arrest the promulgation, or has it abrogated the Orders in Council—those orders which have given birth to a new era in commerce? In spite of all its boasted effect, are not the two nations brought to the very brink of a war? Are we quite sure that on this side of the water, it has had no effect favorable to British interests. It has often been stated, and although I do not know that it is susceptible of strict proof, I believe it to be a fact, that this Bank exercised its influence in support of Jay's treaty—and may it not have contributed to blunt the public sentiment, or paralize the effects of this nation, against British aggression?

The Duke of Northumberland, is said to be the most considerable stockholder in the Bank of the United States. A late Lord Chancellor of England, besides other noblemen, was a large stockholder. Suppose the Prince of Essling, the Duke of Cadore, and other French dignitaries, owned seven-eighths of the capital of this Bank, should we witness the same exertions (I allude not to any made in the Senate) to recharter it? So far from it, would not the danger of French influence, be resounded throughout the nation?

I shall give my most hearty assent to the motion, for striking out the first section of the bill.

MR. CLAY'S PECUNIARY EMBARRASSMENTS.

The partisans of Mr. Clay in Kentucky, have assailed Mr. Barry as a bankrupt, and Mr. Burgess in his tariff speech in Rhode Island said, "The relief party in Kentucky is that party, which have been and still are devising ways and means, not to pay, but to avoid paying their debts. Col. Barry, the opposition, candidate is their leader"*

We shall not now stop to examine the motives which led Mr. Burgess to use this slander upon a large portion of the people of Kentucky; our purpose is to reply to Mr. Clay, for whose benefit this slander is avowedly declared; for in the same speech, Mr. Burgess, speaking of Mr. Clay, says, "what will be done by Kentucky"? "will she array herself against her patron statesman"?

The abuse of Major Barry and his friends, by the partizans of Mr. Clay in Kentucky, has caused recriminating charges against Mr. Clay, and an expose of his private embarrassment, which has drawn from Mr Clay himself, a letter to the public that will be found in another part of our paper.

It is not our purpose to do Mr. Clay injustice, but we feel constrained to state a few facts.

Col. Morrison a wealthy citizen of Lexington, Kentucky, being on a visit to Washington, sickened and died here. Mr Clay as his neighbor and friend, was called in and wrote his Will. The following have been published as extracts therefrom.

"I give to the Trustees of the Transylvania University, and their successors, the sum of 20,000 dollars in trust, to vest the capital in some permanent productive fund, and out of the annual interests or dividends accruing thereon to pay the salary of a professorship to be instituted by them, and to be denominated the Morrison Professorship, or to apply the said $20,000 to the purchase of a Library, to be denominated the Morrison Library, as the trustees may think, will best promote the interests of learning and science."

---

* This Mr. Burgess is the same, who, on the floor of the House of Representatives vented his envenomed spleen against Kentucky, and drew forth the eloquent and able reply of Mr. Daniel. Aware of the effect which his speech, if published, would have on the people of the state, has been suppressed, and it is but fair to presume that this speech was concerted between Mr. Burgess and Mr. Clay's partisans, as a reply to Mr. Daniel. We have understood that Mr. Metcalfe has declared himself an old court man, although he is known to have belonged to the new court party, and was one of those who voted for the forty banks.

The Will provides—

"Lastly, I do nominate and appoint my wife Esther Morrison, Executrix, and Henry Clay, Robert Wickliffe, Farmer Dewees, and Richard Hawes, Executors of this my last Will and Testiment, *and as I apprehend* that my friends, *Henry Clay* and Robert Wickliffe, *from their other engagements, will not have it in their power to take upon themselves as active a part in the general management of my estate as I should wish, I desire that security should not be required of them, for their Executorship.*"

The Trustees of the Transylvania University, in their report to the Legislature of Kentucky last winter said:

"No part of the bequests of Col. Morrison, have come into the hands of the Trustees, save the interest on the legacy of $20,000, which is regularly paid by the Executor, and appropriated to the Morrison professorship. The will of the Testator directs that, no security should be required of the Executor acting. We, consequently have none, except what may be found in his integrity and responsibility."

In reply to an attack upon Major Barry, published as is believed at the instance of Mr. Robert Wickliffe, a writer in the Kentucky Gazette gave the following list of mortgages, made by Mr. Clay and recorded in the clerks office in Lexington.

List of Mortgages made by Mr. Clay.

Book T page 541—Mr. Clay to Bank of the United States, to secure $22,000 dated July 1820, covers the Hotel property in Lexington.

Book V page 173—Mr. Clay to Bank of Kentucky, to secure the sum of $10,000 dated 26 h Dec. 1821, covers 200 acres of land in Fayet e County.

Book W page 132—Mr. Clay to James Harper, to secure $1,666 66 dated 24th December 1822, covers the House opposite John Bradford's in Lexington.

Book Z page 284—Mr. Clay to Samuel J. Donaldson, trustee of the creditors of Samuel and Robert Purviance, Baltimore, to secure $15,527 due. It covers the Hotel in Lexington and the lot fronting on market street and extending from short street to Church ally.

The same writer proceeds to say:

"Do you (Mr. Clay) not owe debts to a large amount besides those provided in the above list of mortgages"

"Was not the debt due to Purviances heirs of Baltimore (secured in the last mentioned mortgage) incurred by your appropriating to your own use, that amount of money collected by you for them as their lawyer, and which you could not pay to them to this day?"

By a perusal of Mr. Clay's letter, it would appear that it was carefully prepared to counteract the effect of the publications, from which we have made quotations. From the reply of the same writer which will be found in this paper, it will appear that all of these mortgages have date since the year 1820, and Mr. Clay, by his silence upon that subject admits that these debts are not all that he owes. He confines himself exclusively to those secured by mortgage, and says that, by the end of the current year, they will be reduced to about two thousand dollars.

It appears by a newspaper publication, that the sum due to John Jacob Aster of New York has been paid—this sum, is stated

At $10,000 to 20,000,	-	$20,000
Bank of the United States,	-	22,000
James Harper,	- -	1,666 6-6
Bank of Kentucky,	- -	10,000
Donaldson,	- - -	15,527
Amount,		$69,193 6-6

Mr. Clay says that he has paid this debt within a few years by living within his income!! He does not pretend to say that he has sold property, because the sale of property to that amount would be a matter of proof, but he has lived within his income!! The question is from whence does he derive his revenue. History informs us that Cardinal Woolsey was a pensioner of the Pope, of Charles and of Francis, at the same time, it also informs us that Charles the Second was the pensioner of the King of France; we know that Woolsey became rich and lived in more splendor than any other subject of the crown. Mr. Clay imitates him so far as to out-strip the most opulent citizen of this district in the splendor of his living—it remains for his partisans to explain the sources of a revenue which is competent to such expenditures.

But it is known that since the date of these mortgages, one of them being in 1822, Mr. Clay has been actively engaged in electioneering; it is known that very few of our most active citizens, have been able to realize a reasonable profit upon capital invested in the most active business. How has Mr. Clay realized so large a sum in the midst of so warm an electioneering conflict?

Mr. Clay endeavors to account for his embarrassments by saying that he endorsed for friends, &c. Did he endorse to Astor, to the University, or to the heirs of Purviance? It appears that he induced his friend, Mr. Morrison, to believe that he could not take upon himself an active executorship, and therefore was not required to give security. Yet, it is charged, and will not be denied, that he became the sole *acting* executor, got the $15,000 in his possession, which the testator had specially provided should be laid out in "some *permanent productive* fund," and that, out of the annual interest accruing thereon, the salary of a professorship to be instituted by the University should be paid, or else that the said sum should be expended in the purchase of a Library, to be denominated the Morrison Library.

Would Mr. Clay have retained this sum of money, thus obtained, if he had an income which would defray the current expenses of his family, living as they do in more splendor than any other family in the District, and also discharge the sum of $49,000, to say nothing of other debts, in six years?

Who can believe that Mr Clay would have applied to his own use $15,527 collected as *attorney* for the heirs of Purviance, if he had an income of seventeen thousand dollars per annum? And yet if we are to believe Mr. Clay's statement, his income cannot have been less than that sum, and he admits that he did apply to his own use the money of his client. Mr. Clay, as an attorney, took an oath faithfully to dis-

charge his duty to his client. Did he faithfully discharge his duty to the heirs of Purviance, by putting into his own pocket $15,000 of their money. Did he faithfully discharge his duty as executor of the estate of Morrison, when he applied the legacy to the University, to his own use, instead of investing it as required by his testator? An ordinary attorney for a like offence would be expelled the bar, and any other lawyer, who had been called in to write a will, and, under pretence that he could not take an active part in the management of the estate, introduced a provision appointing himself an executor, *without security*, would have been suspected, especially if he availed himself of that provision to become the sole acting executor, and obtained possession of large sums of money! That Mr. Clay has done so, and that after he has obtained the money, he has applied $15,000, if no more of it, to his own private use, in violation of the will of his testator, has not been denied.

In our opinion, such acts on the part of Mr. Clay, exhibit a looseness in the discharge of official duty, and a laxity of moral principle, which strike at the root of his character as a man, and should impair the confidence of the people in him as a public functionary.

Our interests as a nation should be entrusted to men whose habits and principles are such as would place them above suspicion, and beyond the reach of temptation. Our intercourse with foreign nations is such, that a *corrupted* diplomatist might "brag a million against a cent," without being *convicted*, although he might be *suspected*.

Mr. Clay's partisans have waged a malignant and vindictive warfare upon the private character of his political opponents. The pecuniary affairs of one, and the domestic relations of another eminent citizen, have been dragged before the public, and Mr. Clay has feasted his insatiable appetite for power on the supposed political effect thereby to be produced. It was well known that no man was more vulnerable in these points than Mr. Clay. He had a right to suppose that the chivalry of his opponents would spare the feelings of his family, and prevent the exposure of his shameless debaucheries; but he had no right to expect that, pecuniary transactions so intimately connected with his moral character, would not, under such circumstances, become the subject of investigation. We know that Mr. Clay has partisans who are ready to denounce us for daring to question the truth of his statements. But we do not hesitate to declare our opinion, that Mr. Wickliffe knew that Mr. Clay's declaration, that he had discharged this immense debt, in so short a time, by the simple process of living within his income, was untrue. Mr. Wickliffe knew that Mr. Clay's salary, and the revenue from his estates were not equal to so great a work. Mr. Clay says:

"A friend lately called on me, at the instance of other friends, and informed me, that they were apprehensive that my private affairs were embarrassed, and that I allowed their embarressment to prey upon my mind. He came therefore, with their authority, to tell me, that they would contribute any sum that I might want to relieve me."

Who was the individual here referred to? Has he large outstanding claims against our own government? or is he one of those whose demands against a foreign power, are to be arranged by *negotiation?* Certain it is that he had some other inducement than mere personal attachment to Mr. Clay, before he would have thus tendered the purse for his relief. But Mr. Clay admits that money has been tendered to him. We believe it is true. We believe it is true that Mr. Clay will leave his present office better, by many thousand dollars, than he entered it. We believe that whilst the expenditures of the government, in the short administration of Mr. Adams, will have exceeded those of his predecessor, for the same period, by more than eight millions of dollars, whilst our ships have almost literally been driven from the ocean, and our commerce, as well *with South America* as the West Indies, almost destroyed, Mr. Clay has taken good care to discharge the mortgages upon his estate, and provide means to wage the war of ambition, when the resources from whence his wants are *now* supplied, shall be dried up.

Let any citizen read Mr. Clay's speech against rechartering the old Bank of the United States, delivered when Henry Clay was a republican in practice as well as theory. Let them contrast his course of public life before he went to Europe, with his public life since his return, and he will find an ample field for contemplation.

From the Kentucky Reporter.

Messrs. Smith and Palmer,

The enclosed letter has been received in the course of a private and friendly correspondence with Mr. Clay, but as it must satisfy all impartial men of the baseness and malignity of those who have attempted to assail his feelings by an exposure of his private affairs, I take the responsibility of requesting its publication in your useful journal and I hope that other papers friendly to the cause of truth, for the satisfaction of the honest of every political creed, will make its contents known.

Respectfully,

ROBERT WICKLIFFE.

Lexington, June 4, 1828.

WASHINGTON, 24th May, 1828.

Dear Sir

The variety in their modes of attack, and the industry of my enemies are remarkable, if not always commendable. I observe that some of them about Lexington have carefully searched the records of Fayette, and extracted from them a most formidable list of mortgages which are paraded as evidence of my bankruptcy. The fairness of this proceeding, in my absence on arduous public service, and without enquiry into the fact whether the mortgages be extinguished or not, is submitted to my fellow citizens of Fayette. I do not consider a man who honestly fulfils his pecuniary engagements as entitled to any special praise or I would not observe, that I can confidently appeal to all with whom I ever had pecuniary transactions, to bear testimony to the fidelity with which I have discharged mine. I invite the severest scrutiny into my conduct, in that respect, and request a comparison of it with that of any one of those who now assail me. I never was sued in my life for an

uncontested debt—indeed I have no recollection, at this time, of having ever been sued for any ascertained debt, contested or uncontested; and whether I was principle or endorser.

(Mr. *Clay* then speaks of a heavy responsibility, incurred about ten years ago, as endorser for his friends—and proceeds)—To that cause is to be attributed my temporary retirement from public life, and the renewal of my professional labors. I then resolved not to endorse for others, except in extraordinary cases, and not to ask others to endorse for me; and that, when it became necessary for me to give security, to pledge, in the form of mortgages, that estate which was the ultimate resource of my creditors. Hence the greater number of the mortgages which have been recently so malignantly exposed to the public observation. Most of them have been long since satisfied. Among this number is one for a debt of $20,000, for the payment of which you had kindly become my surety, every cent of which has long since been discharged. There are not subsisting mortgages upon my estate to the amount of ten thousand dollars, and before the year expires I hope there will not remain more than one fifth of that sum. I have hitherto met all my engagements by the simplest of processes, that of living within my income, punctually paying interest when I could not pay principal, and carefully preserving my credit.

I am not free absolutely from debt. I am not rich. I never coveted riches. But my Estate would even now be estimated at not much less than $100,000. Whatever it may be worth, it is a gratification to me to know, that it is the produce of my own honest labor, no part of it being hereditary, except one slave who would oblige me very much if he would accept his freedom. It is sufficient after paying all my debts, to leave my family above want, if I should be seperated from them. It is a matter also of consolation to me to know that this wanton exposure of my private affairs can do me no pecuniary prejudice. My few creditors will not allow their confidence in me to be shaken by it. It has indeed led to one incident, which was at the same time a source of pleasure and of pain. A friend lately called on me, at the instance of other friends, and informed me, that they were apprehensive that my private affairs were embarrassed and that I allowed their embarrassment to prey upon my mind. He came therefore, with their authority, to tell me, that they would contribute any sum that I might want to relieve me. The emotions which such a proposition excited can be conceived by honorable men. I felt most happy to be able to undeceive them, and to decline their benevolent proposition.

I am with great respect,

Your friend and obedient servant.

H. CLAY.

ROBERT WICKLIFFE, Esq.

From the Kentucky Gazette.

The duty of retorting upon our opponents, the unmanly assaults which they have made upon Major Barry, was *disagreable* but *necessary*. I find that it is felt, and I trust that it will operate a reformation in them, which will show itself in their future conduct. It is my present purpose, however, to expose some of the jesuitical evasions of Mr. Clay, in his letter to Mr. Wickliffe, published in the Reporter. The general tenor of the letter, is a claim to the character of punctuality—an assetion that his propertyis unincumbered, except by a debt of about ten thousand dollars—and that his property is worth one hundred thousand dollars.

As to the first, I believe Mr. Clay has been usually correct in his dealings. I would not do injustice to Mr. Clay; and I cheerfully admit that he has good qualities. But I cannot agree that he has paid or secured the payment of several debts which he justly owes, or that he has not even paid the interest on them. There are three cases of this description which are within my information.

The first is the case of the gentleman who advanced about four hundred dollars for his son at Washington, to pay his debts, which was the only condition upon which he could induce that son to leave the city. Mr Clay had requested that gentleman to make his son leave Washington by some means The only means left was to pay the debts. Mr. Clay has hitherto failed to pay principle or interest, or secure either, although that gentleman needs the money. The expense of one or two dinner parties at the Secretary's mansion at Washington, would pay both principle and interest. The second case is a claim from an honest and industrious tavern keeper in Lexington, who presented a bill for boarding that same son, which was at first protested, then payment promised, then finally refused. The sum thus refused, was about ninety dollars The third case is that of two mechanics in Lexington, whose claim he *shaved*, after having for some time postponed payment.

The second assertion, that his property is unincumbered, except by ten thousand dollars; I will remark, is a palpable evasion. It was asserted, that in addition to the mortgages, Mr Clay owed other debts, which, with those upon record would amount to seventy-four or eighty-four thousand dollars. Why does not Mr Clay answer the questions upon that point? there is one circumstance which is a little remarkable. The mortgages are all dated since January 1820. He must, then, have paid *thirty nine thousand dollars* and *interest*, since that period. I would my self prefere the evidence which releases from the mortgages entered of record, would furnish. But supposing he has paid that amount of those debts, I assert that there are strong reasons to believe, that he owes large sums independent of them. To prove this fact. *I take the declaration of Mr Clay himself*, given to a friend of his to whom owed some few hundred of dollars, *last summer*, when in this country. His friend applied to him for payment. Mr Clay stated to him his embarrassed situation; told him that he was compelled to use all his means, beyond his family and personal expences, satisfy his creditors, who might otherwise push him, and that he was compelled, therefore, to trespass on his friends. He stated that it was with difficulty that he could pay the *interest upon his debts* and meet his expences; and enumerated debts amounting to SIXTY or EIGHTY THOUSAND DOLLARS. This statement so operated on his friend, that he at once told him not to trouble himself any more about his claim. Will Clay say whether he has paid those debts since last sum-

fier, or was his statement then merely a *flam* to obtain indulgence?

The third assertion is, that his property is worth one hundred thousand dollars. I can only say, in reply, that I do not believe it; and that if it is so, the state revenue is defrauded to a large amount of tax, inasmuch as all his property which is in Kentucky is listed at less than forty thousand dollars, as can be seen by the records in the clerk's office of Fayette county. Will Mr. Clay explain this circumstance?

DIOGENES.

Extract from Mr. Clay's Speech, against the renewal of the charter of the old Bank of the United States. From the National Intelligencer, of 25th May, 1811.

"It is argued, that our possession of this English capital, gives us a certain influence over the British Government. If this reasoning be sound, we had better revoke the interdition as to aliens holding land, and invite foreigners to engross the whole property, real and personal of the country. We had better at once exchange the condition of independent proprietors for that of stewards. We should then be able to govern foreign nations, according to the arguments of the gentlemen on the other side. But let us put aside this theory, and appeal to the decisions of experience. Go to the other side of the Atlantic, and see what has been achieved for us there by Englishmen holding seven-tenths of the capital of this bank. Has it released from galling and ignominious bondage, one solitary American seaman, bleeding under British oppression? Did it prevent the unmanly attack upon the Chesapeake? Did it arrest the promulgation, or has it abrogated the Orders in Council—those orders which have given birth to a new era in commerce? In spite of all its boasted effect, are not the two nations brought to the very brink of a war? Are we quite sure that on this side of the water, it has had no effect favorable to British interests? It has often been stated, and although I do not know that it is susceptible of strict proof, I believe it to be a fact, that this bank exercised its influence in support of Jay's treaty—and may it not have contributed to blunt the public sentiment, or paralize the efforts of this nation, against British aggression?

The Duke of Northumberland, is said to be the most considerable stockholder in the bank of the United States. A late Lord Chancellor of England, besides other noblemen, was a large stockholder. Suppose the Prince of Essling, the Duke of Cadore, and other French dignitaries, owned seven-eights of the capital of this bank, should we witness the same exertions (I allude not to any made in the Senate) to recharter it? So far from it, would not the danger of French influence, be resounded throughout the nation?

I shall give my most hearty assent to the motion, for striking out the first section of the bill."

Who could believe, that after Mr. Clay's visit to Ghent, he should become the warm and strenuous advocate of a Bank, with three times the capital, and a ten fold political power? Yet in less than five years, Mr. Clay advocated the present Bank, and soon after resigned his seat is Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of pleading the cause of the Bank, against the State of Ohio. Mr. Clay in the same speech, said: "Perhaps, at last, all power is resolveable into that of the purse, for with it, you may command almost every thing else." ☞The *Bank* wanted Mr. Clay's services, and the *Bank* got them.☜

Extract from Mr. Clay's speech against the U. States Bank, in 1811.

The power of a nation is said to consist in the sword and the purse. *Perhaps, at last, all power is resolvable into that of the purse, for with it you may command almost every thing else.* The specie circulation of the United States is estimated by some calculators at ten millions of dollars: and if it be no more, one moiety is in the vaults of this bank. May not the time arrive when the concentration of such a vast portion of the circulating medium of the country in the hands of any corporation will be dangerous to our liberties? By whom is this immense power wielded? By a body who in derogation of the great principle of all our institutions, responsibility to the people, is amenable only to a few stockholders, and they chiefly foreigners. Suppose an attempt to subvert this goverement —would not the traitor first aim by force or corruption to acquire the Treasure of this Company? Look at it in another aspect. Seven-tenths of its capital are in the hands of foreigners, and these foreigners chiefly English subjects. We are possibly upon the eve of a rupture with that nation. Should such an event occur, do you apprehend that the English premier would experience any difficulty in obtaining the entire control of this institution?

That Mr. Clay had an abhorrence to the old Bank of the United States, is well known; that abhorrence is believed to have originated in his republican education and his local rivalry with John Pope. Mr. Pope was Mr. Clay's colleague in the Senate at the time that Mr. Clay delivered the speech from which this extract is taken, and his vote in favor of the renewal of the Charter, was one of the causes of his loss of popularity in Kentucky.

Mr. Clay, when Mr. Pope left Congress, became the most prominent public man in that body from the West, as such was associated with the Pean Mission. Upon his return from Europe he became the zealous advocate of a new Bank, and was soon, after it went into operation, placed upon its pay roll.

THE UNDER CURRENT AND THE TARIFF.

There is no one who witnessed the discussion upon the tariff bill of the last session, who candidly believes that bill would have passed either house of Congress, had not the Presidential election been pending before the people. Nor have we heard any candid person, at all acquainted with the views of Mr. Adams, express a belief that he would have signed the bill, if a desire to court popularity had not controlled his own opinions of public policy, and public interest. The fact is well known, that Mr. Adams did deliberate, and many who had more confidence in his diplomacy than his integrity, did apprehend, that he would make a demonstration

upon Virginia and the South, by returning the bill with his objections. It is believed that Mr. Clay's influence alone, preponderated and prevented him from doing so.

It is easily to be seen, that Mr. Clay's interests are directly in conflict with those of Mr. Adams, and that whilst the rejection of the bill, was the only movement which the latter had upon the political chessboard, such a move, whatever might have been its effects as to Mr. Adams, would have been political death to Mr. Clay.

A word in explanation. Had the policy and interests of Mr. Adams succeeded, he would have rejected the bill—his partisans in the North, would have united with Virginia and the South, in opposition to it. A convention of Northern and Southern States, would have been invoked, and Mr Adams would have been supported as the advocate of Southern and Eastern interests. The votes of General Jackson, Major Eaton, and others, of his prominent friends, would have been seized upon as an evidence of General Jackson's support of the tariff, and we should then have heard the partisans of Mr. Adams argue, that he never was a tariff man. Let us see what would have been the result. In that event, Mr. Adams would have claimed

New England,	51
New York,	36
New Jersey,	8
Delaware,	3
Maryland,	11
Virginia,	24
North Carolina,	15
South Carolina,	11
Georgia,	9
Louisiana,	5
Alabama,	5
Missis ippi,	3
Making	191 votes.

We saw this state of the question with alarm; we knew the strong excitement in the South, and feared the effect to be produced by an artful appeal to the interests and passions of the people in the anti-tariff States; and we could scarcely believe that Mr. Adams, skilled as he is in diplomacy, and uncommitted as he was upon the subject, would have permitted the only chance of re-election to pass unimproved.

His Ebony genius (Henry Clay) prevailed. Mr. Clay saw that if Mr. Adams was elected upon such terms, the same feeling which elected Mr. Adams, would secure the re-election of Mr. Calhoun, and identify New England and the Atlantic States; and thus he would be left to combat, unaided, the strong attachment of Gen. Jackson's friends for Mr. Calhoun, confirmed by the manner in which the presses now under his control have assailed Gen. Jackson. Had Mr. Adams rejected the bill, Mr. Clay would have had no other alternative, but to leave the Cabinet or abandon his "American System," because the bill, as passed, is more favorable to the great interests, upon which it has been his plan to operate, than any other bill that has ever passed into a law.

We say that Mr. Clay's plans and Mr. Clay's influence prevailed; the bill was approved, and the policy of the Coalition has been early developed. Mr. Clay is indebted to his present elevation for his skill in attaching particular men to himself, and his ability to persuade them that their political elevation depends upon his. Thus Daniel Webster, after making demonstrations (during the last winter) upon the Jackson party, found that his only hope of preferment rests upon identifying himself with the political destiny of Henry Clay, or at least of placing himself at the head of a local party, upon his influence with which he hopes to make terms with the next administration, or to hold a balance of power, which, by a combination of odds and ends, may, by possibility, appoint the successor of Gen. Jackson. Thus we find, John Sergeant in Pennsylvania, Tristram Burgess in Rhode Island, Webster and Everett in Massachusetts, and Ichabod Bartlett and Samuel Bell in New Hampshire, making the most desperate effort to create a local and sectional party, favorable to the administration, and connected with Mr. Clay, while that arch intriguant undertakes to answer for New York and the Western States. That these men are now the representatives of the aristocracy of the United States, and that they all despair of the election of Mr. Adams, is manifest. That they are only solicitious to keep their routed forces together for the contest succeeding the next, is also manifest, and whether they unite and throw their influence upon a republican candidate, or upon one of their own party will depend upon contingencies hereafter to arise. That Judge Thompson of New York, has been *tickled* with the notion that he is to be the candidate of that interest, is obvious, and if Mr. Clay loses the election of Mr. Metcalfe, in Kentucky, he will be prepared to play a secondary part, as he has done to Mr. Adams. Clay is resolved that he will be President himself, or that he who is, shall be indebted to him for power.

Taking this view of the arrangements of the coalition, we cannot doubt but that a plan of the campaign for the next eight years has been settled. And we have as little doubt that Messrs. Clay, Webster, Sargeant, and Co. are to use the "American System" and "*slave labor*," as their hobbies. Hence the dinners and the dinner speeches. They have not *yet* ventured on the all-absorbing question of negro slavery, because Mr. Clay could not afford to lose Kentucky. Let the elections there once be determined, and we shall then see more and more of this new monster reared in the non slave holding States. Seeing that our Southern friends will have to meet this question in all its deformity, we are prepared to appreciate their excitement, and we do look with intense interest upon all their movements in relation to the Tariff.

Although we do not approve the measure, it is not for us to condemn the call of a Convention, *calmly* to discuss this important subject, which has been made in several southern papers. We do not see, however, with what propriety those who have so strenuously advocated the Harrisburg Convention, convened by the friends of a Tariff, can condemn a Convention called by those who are opposed to it. The right of our citizens to assemble and petition Congress for a redress of grievances, is a right secured by the Constitution, and the propriety of its exercise will depend upon the *time*, the *manner*, and the *purposes* for which it is done.

That our brethren in the South intend to dissolve the Union, or to follow the example of

the Hartford Convention, cannot be believed by those who know the patriotism or the chivalry of the South. That all their deliberations upon this subject will be conducted in a spirit of patriotism, we believe; and we conclude these remarks by saying that the American people are intelligent, and that it is the duty of the patriot to appeal to their judgment, rather than their passions.

MOVEMENTS OF THE PEOPLE.

Extracts from Republican Journals.

A true sign, in Herkimer.—At a presidential ballot of the (drawn) grand jury, at our court of common pleas, on the 2d inst. the votes stood, for Jackson 12, Adams 3, and neutral 1. But 17 jurors appeared, and one Jacksonian was absent at the balloting, which was, at the request of an Adams member! We consider this vote as giving a very fair indication of the strength of parties in this county.—[*Little Falls People's Friend.*

More signs—At the training of the uniform companies in this village, on Monday last, a vote was taken for president. In capt. Maison's company of artillery, the vote stood, for Jackson 24, for Adams 6. In capt. Graham's company of riflemen, the vote stood, for Jackson 29, for Adams 3. The commanding officer of the Fusiliers, being an Adams man, declined having the vote taken in his company. We shall not be at all surprised if the election in this town, the coming fall, shall eventuate in about the same manner as in the two companies mentioned. Let us hear no more of Adams' strength in Poughkeepsie.—[*Dutchess True Am.*

Another Sign—At a muster of the Salma Guards on the 3d inst. in this village, a vote was taken on the Presidential question. On counting the ballots, they stood, 30 for Jackson, and *one* for Adams.—[*Syracuse Adv.*

Still Another.—If the following little incident was to be mentioned as evidence of increasing good will towards Jackson, it would tell as much as nineteenths of what is every day given on the other side, in favour of Mr. Adams.

Three new boats were a few days since built and launched at this place, by different owners. One of them was named *Andrew Jackson*, another of them *General Jackson*, and the third *Old Hickory*—and it is said without any concert or previous understanding between the proprietors. Indeed, at least one of them was a little while since strongly on the other side. The last one intended to have called his Andrew Jackson, but when he found one of his neighbors had got that, and another, General Jackson, he determined not to be thus cut out of all allusion to his favorite man, called his *Old Hickory.*—[*Salina Herald.*

From the Albany Argus.

The "great republican" administration meetings!—In addition to the numerous notes of republican correspondents and newspapers, given yesterday, showing the singular paucity of the administration meetings, we subjoin the following:—

Lewis county—To the editor of the Argus, dated Lewis county, June 3.

"Dear Sir—I am happy to inform you that the political prospect in the county of Lewis is good. The old republicans in this county, all of them, with one single exception, are for Jackson.

"Yesterday the administration county meeting, for the purpose of choosing a delegate to attend the state convention at Albany on the 10th June inst. met at Martinsburgh. Notwithstanding every exertion had been used to have that meeting generally attended, for the purpose of making a political show and parade, only *eleven*, all federalists, attended. There are in this county nine towns, six of which were not represented in that meeting. There was one person from Denmark, two from Martinsburgh, and eight from the village of Lowville.

"I understand considerable exertion was used to get Leonard House to attend the meeting, who by-the by, notwithstanding his name is attached to the administration address, is a strong Jackson man, and so declares himself. The Jackson republican strength will be called out in a short time in this county, by a general meeting, and I will assure you that the republicans of the county will show, by their attendance, that the coffin hand bills, &c. have been of no use to the administration in this northern region."

Washington County.—To the editor of the Argus, dated Washington county, June 7.

"The friends of the administration held a county meeting on the 5th, to organize and appoint delegates to the Albany federal convention. It was a complete failure. After all their exertions they were only able to muster *twenty-seven* persons from all the towns in the county!

Martindale was present himself, having only arrived in the county the evening before, interceding for another nomination to congress. I was present, and never witnessed faces on which disappointment was more strongly marked.—They expected to have had 200 or 300 in attendance."

Steuben county.—The Bath advocate exposes the paucity of the Adams meeting in that county, as follows. Nothing can be more ridiculous than the pretension that the people take any part in these gatherings.

"A notice of the meeting was published in the Messenger for three successive weeks previous to the meeting, and in the meantime a number of letters were written by one or more of the Ebony and Topaz party of Bath, calling upon those to whom they were addressed, in the most inviting and pressing terms, to appear on the day and at the place appointed, and join in the great hue and cry against the 'military chieftain.' I mention these facts by way of illustrating the diligence and zeal manifested by the 'getters up' of this mighty caucus. Their success, however, remains yet to be told. Of *twenty three* towns, comprising the county of Steuben, *two* only, to wit:—Bath and Erwin, were represented; and from the latter, *one* person only appeared! The whole number collected, after raking and scraping the highways and hedges of the town and village, including the Erwin representation, amounted to barely ELEVEN."

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH....*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published, weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, JULY 12, 1828. No. 18.

"SKETCH OF JOHN Q. ADAMS."

We have seen a pamphlet, now in circulation in Kentucky, purporting to be an historical sketch of John Q. Adams. The truth of its statements may be tested by the fact, that the same pamphlet undertakes to prove that Mr. Adams received a greater number of votes than Gen. Jackson. Some time last year, we published a letter from the Hon. S. D. Ingham, to the Jackson Corresponding Committee of Philadelphia, in which the claims of Mr. Adams are exhibited in their true colors, under the responsibility of one of the most distinguished statesmen of the age.

By way of counteracting the effect of Mr. Ingham's letter, it has been asserted, *in Kentucky*, that Mr. Ingham was a federalist. If any man may be truly said to have been "died in the wool" a democrat, that man is Samuel D. Ingham. He was a republican in the days which tried men's souls. Upon examining a file of the Aurora, now in the Library of Congress, once the property of Mr. Jefferson, we find an evidence of Mr. Ingham's political opinions, which cannot be disputed. They will be found below, and are now published that our republican friends throughout the Union, may compare the present with the past. At the time that this address was written, Mr. Ingham was a young man, and it is no small testimonial of his worth, to find that this address should have been again republished in the Aurora, then the organ of the Republican party.

Extract from the Address of the Republican Committee of Buck's county, Pa., to their constituents.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS,

We have hinted the reason why some republicans have dissented from your tickets in one or two instances. Those tickets were formed by committees, chosen in such manner as to render it doubtful whether they speak the sense of the majority. The members in some townships were chosen by a very few votes, and those, perhaps, given by a candidate and his friends. In the following resolutions you will find a complete remedy for the evil, provided you co-operate in carrying them into effect. The plan of election proposed, will diminish expense and trouble, at the same time that it combines the votes of the majority of the republicans in choosing future committees. Still, you will please to remember, that no committee, however perfectly constituted, can form a ticket to please you all. They will have their weaknesses and partialities, and must sometimes do wrong. You will have your weaknesses and partialities, and will think they do wrong when they do right. When, therefore, a ticket is recommended which you do not wholly approve, ask yourselves the question, "Shall I support this ticket which contains one or two names which I do not like; or, shall I break the bond of republican union, sink myself and party into political insignificance and contempt, and see tickets prevail from year to year containing not a name that I can approve?" An occasional sacrifice of private opinion to public duty you must make, or your opinion on politics will presently stand for nothing. Would you merit the character of republicans? *Bow to the will of the majority, and support the ticket formed by your representatives.* Would you aspire to the name of patriots? Would you promote the cause of Liberty, and extend its blessings to generations yet unborn? *Cleave to the system of republican union as to the horns of freedom's altar.* Would you merit the appellation of wise men and good politicians? *Take the obvious means to extend your power and influence, and do not madly pull down with your own hands the fabric you erected with so much care.* In fine, would you disappoint the hopes of your enemies, and avoid the ridicule which awaits your fall? *Make your committee a fair representation of the republican interest—support, by your votes, the tickets they recommend—and take for your pole star that political maxim,* "UNITED WE STAND, DIVIDED WE FALL."

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolved, That the Republican Committee of Buck's county, shall hereafter be chosen at the same places and on the same day, as township officers are chosen, viz.: the 3d Saturday of March in every year, between the hours of 4 and 8 o'clock, P. M.

Resolved, That the election shall be published, and conducted in the manner following, viz.:

1. That the Secretary of the Committee for the time being shall give notice thereof ten days before, in one or more of the public papers which circulate generally in the county.

2. The members of the Committee for the townships respectively, shall give the like timely notice thereof by written or printed advertisement, set up in four or more public places in each township.

3. At the same time and place, two Judges of the election and one Secretary shall be chosen, and they or any two of them shall decide on the qualifications of the electors: shall cause this election to be fairly conducted, and certify under their hands the names of the persons chosen.

4. Each township shall elect one, two, or three members at their discretion; but in fixing the ticket for the general election, each township shall have but one vote; and if the members for any township are equally divided, and cannot agree, such township shall lose its vote.

5. The election shall be by ballot; but before it proceeds each elector present shall have an opportunity of putting in nomination as many candidates as he thinks proper.

6. At this election every person shall have a right to elect and to be elected who is entitled to vote at the general election; pr vided he professes to be a democratic republican, and has supported the cha acter for at least six months then last past.

7. If, upon counting the ballots, it shall appear that two or more candidates have equal votes, the electors shall immediately determine the preference by a new ballot or otherwise.

8. From and after the said third Saturday in March, the powers of the preceding county committee shall cease and determine; and the committee, chosen as aforesaid, shall hold its first stated meeting at the public house now kept by Josiah Addis, on the first Tuesday of September then following, at 10 o'clock, in the forenoon. At this meeting a nomination shall be made of candidates to fill the several elective offices of State representatives, sheriffs, coroners, and county commissioners, and also of State Senator and Representative for Congress when occasion requires; and each member shall have a right to put in nomination who and as many as he pleases, provided that any person nominated shall have a right to withdraw his name.

9. The Committee shall cause publication to be made in one or more of the current newspapers of the nomination aforesaid, and of the time and place of fixing the ticket; and they shall accordingly meet at the same place or at Dunlap's tavern, on the third Tuesday of the same month; and shall, between the hours of three and five o'clock, P. M., choose by ballot out of the candidates nominated as aforesaid, the number to be voted for at the succeeding general election.

10. When members of Congress are to be chosen, conferees in behalf of this county shall be elected by the Committee on the said third Tuesday of September, seasonable public notice thereof being previously given; and we advise that the conferees from this and the other counties concerned, meet at Hartzell's tavern, in Northampton county, on the fourth Tuesday of September, and fix the ticket for the representatives to Congress. When the Committee conceive that this county is entitled to furnish a candidate for Congress, they may, by ballot or otherwise, fix the candidate, and instruct their conferees to endeavor to have his name placed on the ticket.

Resolved, That extra meetings of the Committee may be held when six members from three townships shall think it expedient; but in this case, the meeting shall be convened at or near the centre of the county, and ample notice thereof shall be given by the public prints, circular letters, or otherwise; other adjourned meetings may also be held but at such extra or adjourned meeting no measures shall be taken which may affect the formation of the ticket for the general election.

Signed by order of the Committee,

JOSEPH HART, *Chairman.*

SAMUEL D. INGHAM, *Secretary.*

Newtown, Delaware 8th, 1802.

We, to-day, give Mr. Ingham's interesting letter. The high standing of the writer, the importance of the subject upon which he treats, and the able manner in which it is done, will command for it an attentive perusal.

AN EXPOSITION

OF THE POLITICAL CHARACTER AND PRINCIPLES OF

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,

Showing by Historical Documents, and incontestible facts, that he was educated A MONARCHIST: *has always been hostile to* POPULAR GOVERNMENT, *and particularly to its great bulwark,* THE RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE: *and that he affected to become a Republican only to attain the power to pervert and degrade* THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY; *and to pave the way for such a change* OF THE CONSTITUTION *as would establish in these United States,* AN ARISTOCRATICAL AND HEREDITARY GOVERNMENT.

Letter to SAMUEL D. INGHAM, Esq. member of Congress, New Hope, Bucks county, Pennsylvania.

PHILADELPHIA, *Oct.* 30, 1827.

DEAR SIR—The general committee appointed by the democratic citizens of this district, to aid in effecting the election of Gen. Jackson to the Presidency, have directed us to address you.

The character and principles of the present Chief Magistrate of the Union are sincerely believed to be, as a politician, in the enlarged sense of that word, dangerous to the institutions of the country, and, as a party politician, counterfeit and hypocritical. In the last essay from your pen, communicated to the public, you intimate an intention to develope this interesting topic, and to put the results of your research before your fellow citizens.

Considering the subject of much more importance than the ordinary themes of controversy—as one which, treated by you, will confirm the judgment and sentiments of the people of this Commonwealth; the committee regard it as incumbent upon them to request, that they may be made the means of giving to your exposition, if it be prepared, such a diffusion as may be calculated to subserve the noble democratic cause to which they are devoted. On their behalf, therefore, and agreeably to their instruction, we beg that your paper, if completed, may be forwarded to us.

We are, dear sir, very respectfully,
Your friends and servants,
HENRY HORN,
G. M. DALLAS.

REPLY.

GENTLEMEN—I have received your favor of the 30th ultimo, requesting that I will forward to you, in behalf of the General Committee appointed by the democratic citizens of the city and county of Philadelphia, to aid in effecting the election of Gen. Jackson to the Presidency of the United States, the exposition of the political character and principles of the present Chief Magistrate, which I had promised some time since to prepare, and make public. It is gratifying to find that you have so highly appreciated the importance of discussing this branch of the great question which now agitates the public mind, as to have expected even from my very defective labors some beneficial developements. The countenance of so very respectable a body cannot fail to stimulate other and better pens to a more thorough investigation of the same subject, from which, when employed in so extensive a field, we may hope for an abundant collection and disclosure of highly interesting facts.

I transmit the paper you have requested, in the hope that, however deficient in the execution, it may prove of some use to the great cause of public virtue and political principles involved in the present contest. But it seems proper in justice to myself, when presenting this paper for publication, to explain how it has happened that I have been drawn into a discussion of this subject under my own signature. Some time in April last, a meeting of democratic republicans was advertised to be held at Doylestown, in this county, to take into consideration the matters involved in the approaching Presidential election. Owing, perhaps, to the supposition that my public station afforded an opportunity for information on that subject, which was not common to all my fellow citizens, I was specially requested by some of the committee, who called the meeting, to state the principal grounds on which Mr. Adams was deemed less worthy to be supported for the Presidency than Gen. Jackson. I accordingly made such a statement, and with a scrupulous regard to facts either publicly known or susceptible of proof from history or documents. These statements, with some additional matters suggested by others, were made the basis of the proceedings of the meeting, which approved and published them. I was soon after violently assailed in some of the papers that advocate the claims of Mr. Adams for the Presidency, which was followed up by an intemperate attack, somewhat of a personal nature, from Mr. *Jonathan Roberts*, that necessarily caused a reply under my own signature. In the course of his essays, Mr. Roberts undertook a defence of Mr. Adams, against all the allegations in the Bucks county resolutions, in which he rashly denied most of the facts therein stated.

This defence (if such it could be called) contained internal evidence of having been written, in part at least, under the eye of Mr. Adams himself. Thus assailed, and opposed by such high authority, and already embarked in the discussion, I had no choice but to continue it, and present some of the proofs which I had in my possession. Thus have I been forced into this discussion, by circumstances in which I had but little agency, and which I trust will excuse me among my political friends, for what might otherwise have seemed improperly assuming. The exposition will, I hope, satisfy you that the facts asserted in the Bucks county resolutions in relation to Mr. Adams' alleged conversion to democracy can be fully sustained, and that instead of acting the part of an "intemperate cabal," as charged by Mr. Roberts, we have presented them with great moderation.

I am, with very great respect,
Your obedient servant,
S. D. INGHAM

HENRY HORN, and
GEO. M. DALLAS, Esqs.
Great Springs, 1st Nov. 1827.

EXPOSITION, &c.

This paper will be devoted to an exposition of the evidence on which the third allegation in the Bucks county resolutions rests for its support. That allegation is in the following words: "We have the best reason to believe that Mr. "Adams *affected* to become a Republican in "1807, with a view to deceive the democratic "party, and to obtain its assistance to acquire "power, only when he had lost all hope of ob"taining the object of his ambition through his "old political friends."—The answer given to this charge is a simple negative, viz:—"Mr. Adams did not *affect* to become a Republican in 1807, but always was a Republican, in the true sense of that term."

This charge is one of the most serious that has been made against Mr. Adams, prior to the events of the late election. It deeply implicates his political and moral integrity. For it is very clear that he who, without any conviction of error, shall deliberately apostatize from the faith in which he had been educated, and had continued till at the full meridian of life, whether to gratify avarice, ambition, or any other passion, must have cultivated in his moments of retirement the odious art of hypocrisy, and silenced the admonitions of conscience by cherishing a cool premeditated contempt for all moral obligation that conflicted with interest. The charge, it will be seen, is that of an *affected* conversion from federalism to democracy for sinister purposes. It will not be necessary to prove in this place, that there existed an essential difference in principle between the *federalists* and the *republicans*, from an early period of our government. It would be a libel upon both parties to say that the difference which so long agitated the country, was nothing but a mere scramble for power. We have the authority of JAMES MONROE, in confirmation of numerous facts long since recorded as a part of our history, that monarchical principles were not exterminated from our country by the revolution, and that a portion of the whigs had struggled for Independence, but not for Republican Liberty. While Washington ruled, his purpose was to dispose of every thing for the glory and happiness of his country. His singleness of heart and illustrious public services, inspired such universal confidence, that he readily controlled the jarring elements around him, and exerted his power to give such stability and beauty to our government, as would teach all that it was the most perfect system for the preservation of human happiness. But no sooner was his determination to retire at the end of his second term made known, than the deepest anxiety was awakened as to the political principles of a successor. Mr. Adams the *elder* was among the highest toned of the monarchical party. He had labored with great zeal and persevering industry to establish *independence*, and in the dawn of that independence with no less zeal and ability to inculcate *monarchical principles*. For that purpose, he had written several volumes of labored papers, sometimes insidiously disguised, occasionally open and unequivocal. Those who are not familiar with the discussions of 1797-8-9, will better understand these facts by perusing some EXTRACTS from the works alluded to. It will be recollected that *John Adams* wrote his book entitled the "Defence of the American Constitutions," immediately before the organization of the Convention which adopted the present Constitution of the General Government—and *for the purpose* of operating on the minds of the American people, and especially upon the members of the expected convention, in the formation of a government for our Union. The book was written in the years 1786-7-8. The sentiments then expressed will show what sort of Government he would have given us, and especially what were his views of a Democratic Government. These will be found in the following extracts:

"The people in all nations are naturally divided into two sorts, the gentlemen and the simple men, a word which is here chosen to signify the COMMON PEOPLE."—"By the common people we mean laborers, mechanics, husbandmen, and merchants in general, who pursue their occupations and industry, without any knowledge in liberal arts and sciences, or in any thing, but their own trades and pursuits." Vol. 3, p. 458.

"It must be acknowledged, in every State Massachusetts for example, there are inequalities which GOD and NATURE have planted there, and which no human legislature can ever eradicate."—"*Inequality of birth!* Let no man be surprised that this species of inequality is introduced here. Let the page of history be quoted where any nation, ancient or modern, civilized or savage, is mentioned, among whom no difference was made between the citizens on account of their extraction. The children of *illustrious families* have generally greater advantages of education, and earlier opportunities to be acquainted with public characters, and informed of public affairs, than those of meaner ones, or even those in middle life; and what is more than all, an habitual national veneration for their names, and the character of their ancestors, described in history, or coming down by tradition, removes them further from *vulgar jealousy* and *popular* envy, and secures them in some degree the favor, the affection, and respect of the public"—Vol. 1, p. 109-10.

"The son of a wise and virtuous father finds the world about him, sometimes, as much disposed as he is himself, to honor the memory of his father; to congratulate him as the successor of his estate; and to compliment him with election to the places he held."—Same vol. p. 116.

Thus did Mr. Adams artfully attempt to lay a foundation for his favorite theory of an hereditary government. But hear him further:

"The distinctions of poor and rich are as necessary in States of considerable extent, (such as the United States,) as labor and good government; the poor are destined to labor, and the rich, by the advantages of education, independence, and leisure, are qualified for superior stations."—Same vol. p. 369.

These quotations must prove that Mr. Adams was disposed to base his system of government upon the imperfections and corruptions of mankind, and to perpetuate the adventitious inequality in the condition of man, by *incorporating it into the government*, instead of founding it upon a natural equality, and breaking down the contrivances of the old world to maintain and perpetuate artificial distinctions in society. Let us, however, follow him while he attempts to

prove that the people are incompetent to self-government.

"It has been the *common people*, then, and not the *gentlemen*, who have established *simple monarchies* all over the world."—Vol. 3, p. 459.

"It is the true policy of the *common people* to place the *whole executive power* in the hands of *one man*."—Vol. 3, p. 460.

"By *kings and kingly power* is meant the *executive power* in a *single person* "—Same, p. 461.

"*The people themselves*, if *uncontrolled*, will never long *tolerate a freedom of inquiry, debate, or writing;* their *idols* must not be reflected on, nor their schemes and actions scanned, upon pain of *popular vengeance, which is not less terrible than that of despots or sovereign senators.*"—Same, p. 326.

What a libel on the principles of free government, and how strikingly illustrated in the history of *his own* administration, where the *men in power*, for fear of the scanning of *the people*, stopped "*the freedom of inquiry*"—for which they were overturned by the people, whose *idol* (Mr. Jefferson,) maintained and established, as the everlasting maxim of his country, that error of opinion may be tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it!

"The *whole history of Rome* shows that *corruption began with the people* sooner than the Senate."—Same vol. p. 327.

"Sobriety, abstinence, and severity, were *never* remarkable characteristics of *democracy*, or the *democratic branch or mixture in any constitution;* they have oftener been the *characteristics of aristocracy and oligarchy.* Athens, in particular, was never conspicuous for these qualities; but, on the contrary, from the first to the last of her *democratical constitution*, levity, gaiety, inconstancy, dissipation, intemperance, debauchery, and a dissolution of manners, were the prevailing characteristics of the whole nation." Same, p. 344.

"Powerful and crafty *underminers* have no where such *rare sport* as in a *simple democracy*, or *single popular assembly*. No where, *not in the completest despotisms*, does human nature show itself so completely depraved, so nearly approaching an equal mixture of *brutality and devilism*, as in the last stages of such a *democracy*, and in the beginning of despotism, which always succeeds it."—Same, p. 329.

Is there a parasite of the Holy Alliance, in any part of the continent of Europe, that could fulminate a more bitter tirade against popular government? *The people cannot be trusted*:—they will put the yoke on their own necks by giving the executive power to a king; they *will destroy the liberty of the press and of debate;*—with them, *corruption begins.* They are *vicious and debauched*, and terminate their government in a scene of "*brutality and devilism!!!*" Such were the lessons of *political instruction* given to the present Mr. John Q. Adams, when he was about 25 years old. But let us examine a few more extracts from the same work—to show the opinions of the tutor in relation to *popular election.*

"Every passion and prejudice of every voter will be applied to, every flattery and menace, every trick and bribe that can be bestowed, and will be accepted, will be used, and what is horrible to think of, that candidate or that agent who has fewest scruples, who will propagate lies and slanders with most confidence and secrecy, who will wheedle, flatter, and cajole, who will debauch the people by treats, feasts, and diversions, with the least hesitation, and *bribe* with the most impudent front, which can consist with hypocritical concealment, will draw in tools and worm out enemies, the fastest—unsullied honor, sterling integrity, real virtue, will stand a very unequal chance! Where vice, folly, impudence and knavery, have carried an election one year, they will acquire in the course of it fresh influence and power to succeed the next!!!" vol. 3. p. 275.

Could there be more conclusive evidence, not only of Mr Adams' preference of the monarchical system, but of his inveterate hatred of republican government? Not all the servile essays of the hired scribblers for despotic power, nor all the homilies on "the divine right of kings," can furnish within the same compass so many libels, or such evidence of depraved and embittered animosity, against popular institutions. When it shall be recollected that the man who entertained these opinions, and had thus boldly avowed them, was subsequently made President of the United States, and what a hair-breadth escape the American people made in the election of 1800, the patriot cannot help breathing forth a grateful thanksgiving to Providence.

Other extracts may be given from the same work, to show Mr. Adams' preference for *an hereditary government.* "*A nobility must and will exist.*" "*Descent* from certain parents and inheritance of certain houses, lands, and other *visible objects*, (titles) *will eternally* have such an influence over the affections and imaginations of the people, as no arts and institutions will control; time *will come, if it is not now*, that *these* circumstances will have more influence over great numbers of minds *than any consideration of virtue and talents, and whatever influences numbers is of great moment in popular governments and in all elections.*" vol. 3 p. 377.

Thus Mr. Adams contrived a pretext for the establishment of a *political nobility* who should be *hereditary*, and by the glare of their *pedigree* and *fortune*, dazzle the people, and counteract the "*horrible*" evils of an uncontrolled popular election. "Go into New England," says he, "and you will find that the office of justice of the peace, and even the place of Representative, which has ever depended on the fresh election of the people, has generally descended from *generation* to *generation* in three or four families at most." (vol. 1. p. 115.) And for this reason, he would infer, that to establish an *hereditary system* in the *constitution* would only be conforming to the practice and disposition of the people—whom, in another place, when he wanted to weaken public attachment to popular elections, he had so outrageously scandalized.

It may seem superfluous to add to the extracts already given, but I cannot forbear to present a few more.

"There is not," says he, "in the *whole Roman history so happy a period as this under their kings;* the nation was formed, their morality, their religion, their maxims, their government, were all established under *their kings*—the nation was defended against numerous warlike nations of enemies; in short, Rome *was never so well governed and so happy.*" vol. 3. p. 305.

"I only contend that the English constitution *is*, in theory, the *most stupendous fabric of human invention.*" vol. 1. p. 70.

"In future ages, if the present States become a great nation, their own feelings and good sense will dictate to them what to do; *they may make transitions to a nearer resemblance of the British constitution.*" Same, p. 71.

"It (the aristocracy) is a body of men which contains the *greatest collection of virtue and character*, in a free government; is the *brightest ornament and glory of the nation;* and may always be made *the greatest blessing of society*, IF IT BE JUDICIOUSLY MANAGED IN THE CONSTITUTION." Same vol. p. 116.

"This *hazardous experiment* (election of their first magistrate) the Americans have tried, and if elections are soberly made, it *may answer* very well; but if parties, factions, drunkenness, bribes, armies, and delirium come in, *as they always have done, sooner or later*, to embroil and decide every thing, the people must again have recourse to conventions, and find a remedy for this "hazardous experiment." Neither philosophy nor policy has yet discovered any other cure, than by prolonging the duration of the First Magistrate and Senators. The evil may be lessened and postponed by elections for longer periods of years, TILL THEY BECOME FOR LIFE; and if this is not found an adequate remedy, there will remain no other but to MAKE THEM HEREDITARY The delicacy or the dread of unpopularity that should induce any man to conceal THIS IMPORTANT TRUTH from the full view of the people, would be a weakness, if not a vice." Vol. 3. p. 296.

"Mankind have universally discovered that chance was preferable to a *corrupt choice*, and have trusted *Providence* rather than themselves. First Magistrates and Senators had better be made hereditary at once, than that the People should be universally debauched and bribed." Vol. 3, p. 283.

"Thank Heaven, Americans understand; and if the time shall come, *as it is very possible it may, when hereditary descent shall become a less evil than annual fraud and violence*, such a convention may still prevent the first magistrate from becoming absolute, *as well as hereditary.*"—Same, p. 282.

It is impossible by any comment to elucidate the principles of Mr. Adams more satisfactorily than it is done in these texts: that he would have made an *hereditary government* for the United States, compounded of *monarchy* and *aristocracy*, without any mixture of democracy, is most unquestionable; and we have further evidence, that he subsequently maintained the same principles, and continued to urge them wherever he thought he could make an impression When Vice President, he opened a correspondence with the great champion of democracy, Samuel Adams, in which he still insisted upon the necessity of a *nobility branch* to the government. The latter observed, that the form of government most conducive to human happiness, was indicated by "*the natural love of liberty implanted in the human heart,*" to which the Vice President sneeringly replied, that the "natural love of liberty was also implanted in the breast of a WOLF." No sooner was Mr. Adams seated in the Presidential chair, than he exerted the whole power of his administration to establish his favorite doctrines. Offices were given to none but the advocates of his doctrines; and every republican whig, no matter how exalted his talents or virtues, was proscribed. A political badge, the black cockade, was introduced, by which the partisans of the faith could be known: he openly declared while in the Presidential chair, to Mr. Taylor of Virginia, and Mr. Langdon of New Hampshire, that "*he hoped or expected to see the day* when Mr. Taylor and his friend Mr. Giles would be convinced that the people of America *would not be happy without* AN HEREDITARY CHIEF MAGISTRATE AND SENATE, OR AT LEAST FOR LIFE."

This declaration is verified by Mr. Langdon, in a letter addressed to Samuel Ringold, of New Hampshire, dated Portsmouth, October 10, 1800. But he had more powerful instruments than arguments, dogmas, and insidious criticisms: he had the whole patronage of the government of the United States in his hand. The legislative power was employed to muzzle the press, and stop the freedom of discussion, in violation of the most sacred provision of the constitution; and editors of newspapers were punished by fine and imprisonment, for scrutinizing the conduct of public men. This great rampart of liberty broken down, and the constitution undermined, there remained no sufficient barrier to consolidation, and the establishment of privileged orders, *offices for life*, and even *hereditary succession*. In all human probability, the re-election of Mr Adams would have accomplished all he wished in this respect. It was clearly seen, that nothing but a great political revolution could replace the government on its original and true foundation, and preserve the republic! The mighty work was undertaken by the virtuous patriots of the day, by the republican whigs of the revolution. They were denounced by the dependants, expectants, and hirelings of power under Mr. Adams, as a "factious opposition," "disorganizers," "enemies to law, order, and religion;" in a word, as "*Jacobins*" and "DEMOCRATS;" which appellations were intended to designate the abettors of every vice which the author of the "Defence" had characterized as the concomitants of popular government. The struggle was a fearful one on the part of the republicans, and against vast odds: the administration had sought with some success to identify themselves with the government itself; and hence it assumed the name of *federalism*, as a mask in its warfare for *monarchy*, and thousands who deprecated its course, apprehended that a change of rulers would overthrow the government, and produce a scene of anarchy and civil commotion.—Mr. Adams was contending, not merely for another four years, but for the practical establishment of his doctrine and the maintenance of a chief magistracy "*at least for life.*"—But the principles of free government triumphed; the great "Islam" of monarchy was overthrown, and left the seat of government like a deposed king, who feared that the loss of power would be followed by the loss of his head. The accumulated machinery and trappings of latent monarchy were dissipated by his successor, and the government being restored to its original design, moved smoothly on, cultivating and promoting the interest of the people for whom it was made. Mr. Adams retained, however, all his

monarchical heresies, and to these was now added, an increased hostility to every thing that pertained to democracy and the popular system. The immortal Jefferson was for some time the object of his invective. "I shudder," said he, in one of his letters to Cunningham, "at the calamities which I fear his conduct is preparing for his country, from a mean thirst for popularity, an inordinate ambition, and a want of sincerity."

It appears, then, that from the first dawn of independence, while a minister at the court of St. James, through the successive public stations to which he was called, in the chief magistracy of the United States, and after his retirement, when all his vague and false theories had been proved erroneous by experience, he inflexibly maintained and inculcated his monarchical principles. Such was the political creed of the instructor of JOHN Q. ADAMS! Let us now ascertain, if practicable, what effect the instruction of such a school has produced upon his mind: whether he has been an apt disciple of, or at any time proved recreant to this imposing authority.

The first account of his education is to be found in the secret journal of the Old Congress, vol. 2, p. 312, in the following words: "The Committee, consisting of Mr. Forbes, Mr. Mathews, and Mr. Houston, to whom was referred a report of the commissioners of accounts of the 25th October, 1779, on the accounts of the Hon John Adams, late one of the commissioners of the United States to the court of Versailles, report: That they do not find any vote or proceeding of Congress, nor are they informed of any general or received custom on which *the charge of moneys for the education of the accountant's son*, can be admitted; and though the same is inconsiderable, they are of opinion it ought to be rejected, that a precedent be not established." The younger Mr. Adams could not certainly be responsible for this transaction, but it is given as an interesting fact in the family history. Nor could he be responsible for his foreign education and early introduction to the splendor of European courts, nor for the political lessons inculcated by his parent; while these have given the cast and direction of his mind, which now so deeply interest the American people. The first work from the pen of Mr. Adams the younger, which seems to have developed his political principles, was written in 1793, at an early period of the French revolution. The overthrow of the French despotism, and the substitution of a government having the appearance of more freedom, was hailed by the friends of liberty throughout the world, and most especially in the United States, with a feeling of universal joy; none but monarchists deplored the event, and what is remarkable, none deplored it more than the monarchists of the United States. Very few of these, however, had betrayed their feelings so early as 1793; and yet we find Mr. Adams enlisted with so much zeal against the republicans of France, that he engaged in controverting the doctrines of one of the most efficient and popular writers of our revolution against the principles of monarchy. The well known series of papers under the signature of 'Publicola,' was the offspring of this labor. They were written in defence of royalty, against the doctrines of the Rights of Man. These papers breathe, in almost every line, a disguised hostility to republican principles, and the same devotion to monarchy which is found in the writings of his father, and also the same animosity to the great republican leader of that day. Mr. Jefferson is stigmatized as the "Islam of Democracy," and his favorable opinion of the "Rights of Man" is criticised with a censorious ardor better fitting a parasite of George the third, or of Louis the sixteenth, than the citizen of a nation but just emancipated from the yoke of a kingly government, and which had staked all its hopes upon a government the very opposite of monarchy.

Time and space will not permit many quotations from this work. A few will suffice to prove its character and its coincidence of design with that of the author of the Defence of the American Constitutions, written in 1787. The elder Adams said, that "the British Constitution was the most stupendous fabric of human invention:" the younger Adams said, in his Publicola, that "the British Constitution was the admiration of the world!" The expression merely varied to avoid plagiarism. The latter further remarks, that "the people of England have delegated their whole power to the king, lords, and commons," and then adds: "that *the power of the people ought to be delegated for their benefit!*" Such is his account of the Constitution which is the "admiration of the world," and such his opinion of the capacity of the people for self-government! He virtually asserts the doctrine, that "the people are their own worst enemies," and that all power should be given up by them, and removed as far from their reach as possible. In the same work he declares that "it is not the *mechanical horror* against the *name of king* or *aristocracy*, nor the *physical antipathy* to the sound of an extravagant title, nor the *sight of an innocent ribband*, that can authorize a people to lay violent hands on the constitution which protects their rights and guards their liberties." The constitution of the old French government, with its innocent ribbands, and bastiles, and lettres-de-cachet, seemed to have inspired the veneration of our young author, who, according to Mr. Jonathan Roberts, had "always been a republican, in the true sense of that term!"

From about this period Mr. J. Q. Adams was employed on a foreign mission, which Mr. Roberts has been instructed to say, was in consequence of the recommendation of Mr. Jefferson, the "Islam of democracy," who it seems was so well pleased with Mr. Adams' monarchical doctrines in Publicola, his attack upon the "Rights of Man," and lastly the violent assault upon his own public conduct and principles, that he would insist upon requiting him with a foreign mission!!

While abroad in Prussia, Mr. Adams wrote his SILESIAN LETTERS. The shrewd editors of the Edinburgh Review, thus speak of this work—vol. 5, page 182: "Mr. Adams has many recollections of his native country, but his feelings about it more resemble the loyal acquiescence of a subject, than the personal interest and ardor of a republican."

If Mr. Adams had felt the "ardor of a republican," it would have been impossible for him to have concealed his feelings, when writing in a foreign country, where every thing around him relating to human happiness and civil liber-

ty, when contrasted with those subjects in his own country, could not fail to animate him with proud gratulation.

Not long after his return from Prussia, we find him again in his native State, adopted as the leader of the fallen party in New England. Having failed in an election to Congress against the republican candidate, he was taken up for the Senate in 1803, and after several ballotings chosen by the exact number of votes necessary to a choice, against the republican candidate, (T. S. Skinner.) At the succeeding session, Mr. Pickering was associated with him, being elected by the same party. At this period the two great parties, republican and federal, were as much at variance as at any period of our history, and I take it for granted that he was then acting in good faith with the people who elected him to the Senate. His votes all indicate the most decided opposition to the measures of Mr. Jefferson's administration, and a very marked personal hostility to that great man was evinced in his doggerel satires in the Monthly Anthology. In obedience to the jealous feelings of the eastern federalists, he *opposed* every measure for the introduction of Louisiana into the Union; he even voted against paying the militia who had been ordered out by law to receive possession of the country; and moreover maintained his monarchical principles in every vote upon the organization of the government of that territory:—he voted for a landed property qualification to every elector as a condition for his right of suffrage; he refused to pay respect to the memory of the great republican leader in Massachusetts, Samuel Adams, as will be seen by a reference to the Senate Journal, October, 1803.

These Journals abound with votes in uniform concert against the republican majority of the Senate. If Mr. Adams was then "a republican, in the true meaning of that term," so was Timothy Pickering, and so were the Daggets and Griswolds, and Quincys, and Otis's, and every body that was struggling to overthrow Mr. Jefferson's administration.

The private correspondence of the Ex-President with Mr. Cunningham, commencing in November, 1803, furnishes an unerring guide to mark the progress of the political changes in the conduct of *both father and son*. In January, 1804, the elder Adams, then still indulging his hostility to democracy, offers to furnish Mr. Cunningham anecdotes from his memory "to develope the true character of the salt mountain philosopher," (Mr. Jefferson.)

In a letter dated Feb. 24, 1804, he maintains the doctrine laid down in his "Defence," viz: that "rank and wealth are just principles of precedence in a republic"—and adds, that "if "a family which has been high in office, and "splendid in wealth, fall into decay from profli-"gacy, folly, vice, or misfortune, they general-"ly turn democrats, and court the lowest of the "people with an ardor, an art, a skill, and, "consequently, with a success which no vulgar "democrat can attain." "In theory," says he, "all governments profess to regard merit alone, "but in practice, democratical governments "certainly regard it as little as any."

In a subsequent letter, dated March 15th, 1804, he observes to his correspondent thus: "You say the awful *spirit of democracy* is in great progress." I believe it, and I know something of the nature of it. It is a young rake who thinks himself very handsome and well made, and who has little faith in female virtue: when the people once admit his courtship, and permit him the least familiarity, they soon find themselves in the condition of the poor girl who told her own story in this affecting style: "The next day he grew a little bolder—but promised me marriage. The next day he began to be enterprising; but the next day—oh! sir, he got me with child."

"Democracy is *Lovelace*, and the people are *Clarissa;* the *artful villain* will pursue the innocent lovely girl to her ruin and her death."

"The federalists appear to me to be very inattentive to the public events as well as character." The letter from which these extracts are taken, teems with hostility to prominent republicans in New England, and elsewhere, and is pure orthodox federalism as to men and measures and principles. During this period, the *son*, as had been observed, was acting in full concert at *Washington;* for whose advancement the father appears to have been most deeply interested, which was the chief object of his correspondence with Cunningham. There is a chasm in the correspondence, however, from 1804 to 1808, and before we return to it, it may be as well to notice some incidents in relation to the political progress of the *younger Adams*.

There is no evidence of any disposition on his part to secede from his federal friends until some time in 1807. In the spring of that year, "he presided (says the Boston Statesman,) at a federal caucus which nominated Caleb Strong for Governor, and Christopher Gore and Harrison G. Otis for Senators of Massachusetts" !!!

"About the same time, at the table of an illustrious citizen, now no more, he lamented the fearful progress of the democratic party and of its principles, and declared that he had long meditated the subject, and had become convinced that the only method by which the democratic party could be destroyed, was by joining with it, and urging it on with the utmost energy to the completion of its views, whereby the result would prove so ridiculous and so ruinous to the country, that the people would be led to despise the principles and to condemn the effects of democratic policy; and then, said he, WE MAY HAVE A FORM OF GOVERNMENT BETTER SUITED TO THE GENIUS AND DISPOSITION OF OUR COUNTRY, THAN OUR PRESENT CONSTITUTION."

This charge, says a writer in the United States Telegraph, was attempted to be denied in the National Journal, a paper established by Mr. Adams, to promote his election, and mainly edited by him, and the Statesman and other papers which had repeated this charge were called upon for their authority about the time the battle was over." Horatio Townsend, Esq. a gentleman of character, the Clerk of the Judicial Court of the State for the county of Norfolk, and the neighbor and friend of Mr. Adams, was named as one who had heard these declarations, and had often repeated them. It was also stated by the editors of the Statesman, that they had been informed that these declarations were made at the table of the late Chief Justice Parsons, then the great leader of the federal party in Massachusetts." Mr. Townsend was a friend of Mr. Adams, disposed to do every thing which in conscience he could do to help his cause, and

ne gives his certificate and affidavit as follows:

DEDHAM, *Nov.* 6, 1824.

I, Horatio Townsend, Clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court, and of the Court of Common Pleas, &c. for this county, having this day heard read to me, the article in the American Statesman and City Register of this date, headed "Explanatory," hereby make solemn oath that I have no recollection of ever having dined at the table of the Honorable Theophilus Parsons, in company with Mr. John Q. Adams, nor do I believe, that I ever met Mr. Adams in company with the late Chief Justice Parsons, at any time subsequent to my leaving Mr Parsons' office as a student in the spring of 1783.

HORATIO TOWNSEND.

This very singular defence was relied upon, and is the only answer given to refute the charge. It was of no importance when the conversation occurred, and yet Mr. Townsend, the witness and friend of Mr. Adams, only proves that it could not have occurred at Chief Justice Parsons in his presence—he says not one word as to the fact in dispute, the denial of which, he, as a man of intelligence, well knew would have been infinitely better evidence than to have disproved fifty locations of the conversation. So far from weakening the truth of the charge, the affidavit of Mr. Townsend, without any further evidence, gives it additional strength, and leaves the only material fact to be irresistibly inferred. But let us see what two other respectable witnesses have stated—viz: John B. Derby, Esq. Counsellor at Law of Norfolk, and son-in-law of Mr. Townsend, and James Richardson, Esq. Counsellor at Law of the same county.

AFFIDAVIT.

I, John B. Derby, of Dedham, late of Medfield, in the county of Norfolk, of lawful age, testify and say, that one evening in the summer of 1820, being at the house of Horatio Townsend, Esq. of Dedham, conversing with said Townsend on the political character of J. Q. Adams, and objecting to Mr. Adams on the ground of his desertion of federal principles; said Townsend asserted that Mr. Adams *was in heart, a federalist*, although acting with the democratic party, and for proof thereof, stated that he, Mr. Townsend, being many years before in company with Mr. Adams, and other distinguished federalists, previous to Mr. Adams' political conversion, [I think at the late Chief Justice Parsons,] Mr. Adams, speaking of the increasing power of the democratic party, used in substance the expressions attributed to him by the author of "One of the People," published in the Statesman of July last. Afterwards, in the spring, I think, of 1822, the said Townsend being at my house in Medfield, on my again introducing the discussion of the same subject, repeated the same declarations of Mr. Adams in similar language—that John Quincy Adams made such observations, I do not know, but I was constrained to believe that he made them by the frequent and confident assertions of Mr. Townsend. That Mr. Townsend said in substance what I have here stated, is confirmed by the Hon. James Richardson, who says that he immediately recollected having heard Mr. Townsend so express himself in conversation once at said Townsend's house, and also at his office, and that it occurred to him before he knew that he was designated as one of those to whom the above statements of Mr. Townsend were addressed.

(Signed) JOHN B. DERBY.

NORFOLK, ss. *November 8th*, 1824.

Then the above named John B. Derby declared on oath that the above statement subscribed by him was true.

(Signed) ERASMUS WORTHINGTON,
Justice of the Peace.

On the back of the affidavit is the following certificate:—

I have read the part of the within affidavit which relates to myself, and declare it to be substantially true.

(Signed) JAMES RICHARDSON.

This evidence, which remains uncontradicted and unexplained, is of itself conclusive of the fact charged in the Bucks county resolutions, and of an offence even much more odious—not merely that he was insincere in his conversion, and used it to gain power, but that he meditated such a purpose with a view to the prostration of the democratic party in the United States, by means the most unworthy that could have been imagined in the worst days of the Hartford Convention.

This declaration was obviously made for the purpose of being secretly communicated to certain of his old political friends, with a view to avert their indignation against him for his apparent desertion of their ranks. Some were in the secret of his movements, and exulted in his elevation to the Presidency, before his public assurances were given; hence, said Josiah Quincy, when he heard of the election of 1825, "those who fell with the first Adams, have risen with the second."

In the session of 1807–8, the grand movement upon the democratic party was made by Mr. Adams. The only authentic account of it is to be had from Mr. Randolph's speech delivered in the Senate the day before he went to the field with Mr. Clay, and which he expressed a particular desire to have published in the event of his falling in that combat. The speech has never been published, and it is believed the reporters do not intend to publish it: many hundreds of persons were present when it was delivered, and it is impossible that the facts stated can be materially mistaken.

Mr. Randolph read a letter from a gentleman in Virginia, detailing the facts as he had them from Mr. Giles, substantially as follows, viz.:

That Mr. Giles and Mr. Adams were members of the same Committee; that they sometimes rode together in the same carriage; that Mr. Adams became serious, anxious, and seemed weighed down with care for some time; when he at length told Mr. Giles, that he had a matter of *great importance* which he thought it his duty to relate to Mr. Jefferson, then President: but did not know how to approach him, and desired Mr. Giles to make the communication. The latter encouraged him to do it himself, which he did. Mr. Adams informed Mr. Jefferson, "that the federalists of New England were plotting with the government of Canada a treasonable secession from the Union—that their schemes had been disclosed to him—that he had once believed them to be patriotic, but could no longer act in concert with them." Mr. Jefferson relied on his honor, and believed

the statement. Mr. Adams gave in his adhesion to the executive, and was ready from that time forward, as he openly declared in Senate, to "act without deliberation" in favor of whatever he recommended.

I forbear any comment upon these facts, further than to observe, that if the charge was *true*, how does Mr. Adams reconcile his present intimate association with the very men he then so solemnly denounced as plotting treason against his country? And if it was not true, I leave to others to find language to express the atrociousness of the calumny. The events of 1813–14 furnish a much clearer development of the views of certain men in New England, which I shall have occasion to refer to hereafter.

We have now arrived at the period when the Cunningham correspondence re-commenced. The ex-president, whose feelings appear throughout to have been in perfect unison with those of his son, ceases to pour out invectives against Mr. Jefferson and democracy: speaks of the "federalists administering their nauseous oil," "to excite a momentary flash"—"in his old lamp" before it expires:—defends his old measures; abuses Hamilton; thinks "Pinckney can never rise to the chair," and that "he ought never to have been nominated for it." culogizes the conduct of his son as "able, upright, candid, impartial, and independent:" "applauds and admires" his letter to Otis; but thinks "he would have been more politic if he had declined the invitation to the caucus" which nominated Mr. Madison: considers "the policy of a limitation to the embargo a nice question:" says "the federalists by their intolerance have gone far towards justifying Mr. Jefferson for his:" that "our government is for ever to be a party government, and the only hope is, that in the game of leap frog, once in eight or twelve years, the party of the *Outs*, will leap over the heads of the *Ins*," and that he would "nearly as soon see one party absolute and unchecked as the other!" Such are the views of the first letter to Cunningham *after* Mr. J. Q. Adams' adhesion to the administration at Washington. Mr. Cunningham was engaged in preparing the way with his pen for the advancement of Mr. J. Q. Adams to the presidency, and although he writes well, and with all the feeling of a partisan engaged in what he believes to be a good cause, seems not to have been very quick-sighted in discovering the particular motive for the change of tone in the ex-president's letter. Cunningham proposes to attack Mr. Jefferson. Mr. Adams does not respond to this part of his plan, but adverts to the measures of Washington's administration, in which he had taken part, and to his opinion of his son's talents, and furnishes Mr. Cunningham with a copy of a commendatory letter from Washington to himself, written Feb. 20, 1797. This letter has lately gone the rounds through all the administration papers, and therefore deserves some notice. It will be recollected that Mr. Adams was elected in the fall of 1796, by a small majority over Mr. Jefferson. On the 2d Wednesday in February, the votes were ascertained in the presence of both houses, and the result declared. Between this time and the 20th, it appears from President Washington's letter, that Mr. Adams sent him a paper written by his son J. Q. Adams, accompanied by a suggestion of some *delicate* doubts of the propriety of promoting him. Mr. Adams was not invested with the executive authority until the 4th of March following, but the aggrandizement of his family seemed to have been an early and primary consideration; and the sanction of President Washington was thus eagerly and cunningly sought, at the first and most propitious moment to promote his future plans for a family inheritance.

This object, although frustrated by the election of 1800, and for some time after regarded as hopeless, now, viz.: in 1808, began to revive, and from that time forward the "illustrious family" which had fallen "into decay," "turn democrats, and court the lowest of the people, with an ardor, an art, and a skill, and consequently with a success, which no vulgar democrat can attain."

Gore and Pickman* were denounced as the "sons of refugees," Lloyd as the "son of a Tory," Hamilton was an "intriguer," Pickering a *weak, vain*, vindictive, and dishonest man. The Tories, who had been all in all at the election of 1800, (insomuch that the whig federalists could no more celebrate the 4th of July in many parts of the Union, than the Administration democrats can celebrate the 8th of January now,) were to be put down, and Mr. Adams, who had lost sight of the Revolution and its principles, from the moment he began to write his "Defence," down to his son's adhesion in 1807, now became all alive to Whiggism and the principles of the Revolution; and said, "that the portrait of Washington ought not to shove aside the portraits of John Hancock and Samuel Adams in Faneuil Hall," viz. the same Samuel Adams whom J. Q. Adams not long before refused by his vote in the Senate to pay respect to the memory of, by wearing crape on his arm. As his hopes for his son revived, he received new life and vigor, and at the age of seventy-four, boldly enters upon the arena as a political gladiator, and with "the enthusiasm of forty," attempts to "ride the whirlwind," which he had before said "would be delirium."

He informs Mr Cunningham, in his letter of December, 1808, "*in confidence*, that considerable pains had been taken to persuade his friend J. Q. Adams to consent to be run (for Governor of Massachusetts) by the Republicans; but he (was) utterly averse to it—and so am I," said the father in perfect concert—"for various reasons—1. The office, though a precious stone, is but a carbuncle shining in the dark;" "he would stand in competition with Mr. Lincoln, which would divide the republican interest, and "*it would produce an eternal separation between him and the federalists*," "with little prospect of doing any good, or acquiring *any honor, or receiving any profit*." The policy was to move more gradually, get hold of the Republicans, but not to let go of the Federalists. Did this look like a sincere conversion to republicanism? Was it not a politic movement to keep an anchor upon both parties, ready as occasion might serve, to slip the one, and warp up on the other?

After all the exertion by the father, in writing volumes for the papers, traducing the men with whom he had acted when in power, and "*courting the people*" with "*more art*" than was at

* See Cunningham's Letter.

tunable by a plain "*vulgar democrat*," his son only received an appointment as *Minister to Russia*. This was a severe blow; he wanted the State Department under the new administration of Mr. Madison, but he "was banished because he was too just!"—From this time hope was clouded, but not abandoned.

The ex-president constantly relied with full faith on his old maxims; and one laid down in the 3d volume of his "Defence," page 278, London edition, seems to have preserved and inspired his hope at this period—he there says, that "Continuation of power in the same persons and families, will as certainly take place in a simple democracy, or a democracy by representation, as in hereditary aristocracy, or monarchy. *The continuation will be certain, but it will be accomplished by corruption*, which is worse than a continuation by birth; and if corruption cannot effect the continuation, sedition and rebellion will be resorted to; for a degraded, disappointed, rich and illustrious family, would, at any time, annihilate Heaven and Earth, if it could, rather than fail of carrying its point."—His abjuration of the party, and abuse of the men with whom he fell in 1800; his letters, charging them with being the "calves of John Bull,"* "British bears and tory tigers," his sympathy for "the poor democrats," and the whole of his essays in the Boston Patriot, seem indeed like an attempt to move "Heaven and Earth" to "effect the continuation" of power. "But my sons," said he, in his letter of the 22d June, 1809, "were delighted that I had taken the subject up." The *degraded, disappointed*, and ILLUSTRIOUS FAMILY, was all in motion for "carrying its point." Still hope was clouded, "Aristides is banished because he is too just: he will not leave an honester or abler man behind him." "I HOPE, (said the father,) his absence will not be long," and in the mean time he carries on the work, which had previously so "delighted" his sons.

The plan of operation was for the father to fight the battle, and prepare the public mind for the admission of the son into the republican ranks, without exposing him in action; but the progress of their joint efforts had not kept pace with their expectations; the *banishment of Aristides* was a sore postponement of the fruition of their labors.

The son evidently left the country for Russia, brooding feelings of disappointment and vexation, which we find fully matured in his famous letter to Levitt Harris,† recently made public.

A brief history of this letter is as follows: Mr. Adams was Minister resident at St. Petersburg, where Harris was Consul General; a very cordial and friendly intercourse was kept up between them at St. Petersburg, and when Mr. Adams left that place for Ghent, he appointed Mr. Harris Charge des Affaires in his room. He confided in him as the protector of his family, had written him many confidential letters, and among these the famous letter from Ghent. Harris was afterwards accused of official corruption while Consul General, and Mr. Adams, then Secretary of State, backed the accusation by zealously embarking in it, and becoming the principal witness against him; his testimony, all relating to facts within his knowledge while at St. Petersburg, and before he made Harris Charge des Affaires, and subsequent to which he maintained this very friendly official and confidential personal intercourse with him, and wrote the letter alluded to, which came out on the trial.

It should be observed, that this letter was written while Mr. Adams was employed in the Ghent negotiation, and it was no doubt inspected by the British commissioners, who had such ascendancy in the Netherlands as to have commanded complete access to the Post Office, and the aid of those who make a trade of opening letters, imitating seals on paper, and counterfeiting envelopes, &c.; but this was only a defect in the discretion of the *diplomatist*; it *might have* done serious injury, but it did not. The sin of this letter lies deeper; it goes to the *heart of the man*. It evinces great confidence in, and friendship for, Mr. Harris, at a time when, as Mr. Adams has since sworn, he had notes upon his diary of Harris's official corruption. I will not name the alternative of this dilemma. But the sin lies *still deeper; it goes* to the CHARACTER AND PRINCIPLES OF THE AMERICAN CITIZEN. His country involved in war, *he* employed in a high confidential station of the government, located in a foreign land, surrounded by those whose feelings were all against us, looks back upon the land of his nativity, sees it invaded by a most formidable force, collected "to crush us at a blow;" the battles of Niagara, the victory of Plattsburgh, the triumph of Lake Champlain, and the glorious defence of Baltimore, excite not the smallest appearance of gratification, much less the enthusiastic exultation which no patriotic mind could have suppressed: Not only is there an utter destitution of any glow of patriotism or national pride, which such events must have inspired in the breast of any real American, but he takes some pains to depreciate their character and value—and most especially those battles wherein the militia had been distinguished for their gallantry. That of Plattsburgh and Baltimore, are disposed of with the same sneer—even the prowess of the enemy is underrated, to give point to his slur against the American militia—not content with degrading those who fought so bravely at Baltimore and Plattsburgh, he assails the character of the whole body.

"The firebrand Cockburn," says he, "has kept the rawest of our militia in countenance by his expertness in the art of running away." The simple meaning of which is, that the cowardice of the "*rawest*" of our militia was only surpassed by the cowardice of the enemy; in other words, that our militia were too expert in the art of running away, to fight an enemy that was even more expert in that art than they! Could any form of expression be devised more defamatory and slanderous of the character of his countrymen, than is contained in these few words?—But not content with this, he next assails *both the political parties* of the country, including every body *but the Adams family*, and even the form and character of the government itself—"a weak and penurious government, with but five frigates for a navy and scarcely five regiments for an army!" This denunciation implicated the administration and the whole party in power, as well as the Government; and as to the army, contained a most unwarrantable

* See Cunningham's Letter

† See Appendix.

misrepresentation: it then consisted of forty regiments, and provision had been made for filling the ranks at more expense than was ever incurred for the same object by any other government. "One half the nation sold to the enemy!" What a piece of information for the British commissioners! and how wickedly false! The only serious disaffection existed among a few of those whom Mr. Adams had so much dreaded an "eternal separation" from in 1808, and whom he has now so closely united with! "Sold to the enemy!" What a monstrous slander of the great body of federalists in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, &c.

But the whole letter was conceived in the same temper that his father indulged in for some time before towards both parties; his sound "talents and integrity"* had been "insulted" by one party, and were "neglected" by the other. "The two factions have conspired together," said he in his letter of 23d February, 1809, "to smother all my glory"—"our parties at present," said he, "resemble two ladies of easy virtue, in whose quarrels and scoldings, one reproaches the other with her weakness with a lover the last night, and the other retorts you are worse than I, for you committed adultery the night before, and put horns upon your husband—unfortunately there is too much truth in both. Neither party, however, in the insolence of their rage, can avoid throwing out something in honor of John Adams."

Such was the strain of the father, when he found that his son could not be Secretary of State; that "Mr. Giles, Mr. Monroe, Mr. Pope, Mr. Mitchell, and Mr. twenty others, would *be more likely.*"—He most cordially hated both parties, and his hatred increased in a duplicate ratio with the declension of his hopes for the advancement of his son.—Determined, however, to move heaven and earth rather than fail of carrying his point," "he declares that he will not die for nothing," and "his pen shall go as long as his fingers can hold it!"—But Mr. J. Q. Adams was banished to St. Petersburgh, "because he was too just!" the family were mortified, the son went off in a sullen mood, which he had been brooding over for several years, when he was ordered to Ghent; but that mission appeared hopeless; the British Ministers had given in their sine qua non, and our heir of the "illustrious family" "in decay," fancied he saw in the "signs of the times," something that promised at least some revenge for the *insults and neglect* he had experienced, and possibly in his mind's eye, beheld the germ of some new coalitions that would resuscitate their hopes, and verify his father's oracular declaration in the third volume of the "Defence," viz: that "there will be a continuation of power in the same families as certainly in a democracy as in an hereditary aristocracy," which "will be accomplished by corruption," *or if not*, "by sedition and rebellion." Some expectation of this sort must have filled his mind when he wrote the hypocritical, cold, heartless, and treasonable letter to Harris.—He was so wrapt up in his own ambitious hopes, and chagrined by his insults and *neglects*, that he evidently thought of nothing but condemning all the people in the United States, except his own family. This letter, in all its aspects, is a most important document: it affords an unerring guide to discover the true political character of Mr. J. Q. Adams. But we must pass on.

* See Cunningham's Letter.

Upon the accession of Mr. Monroe to the Presidency, Mr. Adams was brought into the State Department. One of his first acts having relation to the politics of New England, was the appointment of Benjamin Russell, editor of the Boston Centinel, to print the laws of the United States. The former public printer had been a firm and undeviating republican, and supporter of the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison, and of the country in the late war with England;—he had never wavered under the most appalling frowns of the faction that had then raised "the standard of moral treason on the confines of the constitution." A few extracts from the Centinel will show its character at the same time.

We have already mentioned the hostility of *Mr. Adams* to the purchase *of Louisiana*, and its adoption into the Union. The Boston Centinel for 1813, when war existed with Great Britain, *renewed* the complaints against the Administration for that measure. It was the sore grievance of New England, destructive of the political power of Massachusetts, and of "*the influence in the councils of the nation to which she was so justly entitled.*"

It was resolved by the same Massachusetts Legislature which organized the Hartford Convention, that "*the act for the admission of Louisiana into the Union, &c. is a violation of the Constitution of the United States.*" Mr. Adams held the same opinions in 1804, and reiterated them in 1823. This was one of the pillars on which the opposition of 1813 rested for their justification. The toasts of the 4th of July, with which the Centinel abounds, indicate the character of the men and of the times. A few extracts will sufficiently exemplify:—

BOSTON CENTINEL, *July* 6, 1814.

"THE FEDERALISTS OF THE UNITED STATES:—Called a contemptible minority, but like the Cossacks of the Don, rendered formidable *by circumstances.*"

THE LOANS—may those who aid in the prosecution of an unjust war, receive exchequer bills, *payable in Elba.*"

THE TREE OF LIBERTY—*let superfluous branches be lopped away*, that *fruitful boughs may live.*

THE FRENCH CITIZENS, THOMAS JEFFERSON AND JAMES MADISON, fellow disciples of the same school, and fellow laborers in the same cause with their friend, "*the imperial butcher of the human race.*"

In the month of October following, a committee of the House of Representatives on the Governor's message, report resolutions to raise 10,000 men, and accept the service of any volunteers to march to *any part of the commonwealth*, and in addition thereto, the following resolution, viz:

"That —— persons be appointed as delegates from this legislature to meet and confer with delegates from *the States of New England*, or any of them, upon the subject of *their public grievances and concerns*, and upon the best means of preserving our resources, and of defence against the enemy, and to devise and suggest for adoption, by those respective States, such

measures as they may deem expedient, and also to take measures, if they shall think proper, for procuring *a convention of delegates* from all the United States, in order to revise the Constitution thereof, and more effectually to secure the support and attachment of all the people, by placing all upon the basis of fair representation." This resolution was adopted, 260 to 90—and the Boston Centinel, Nov. 9, 1814, in noticing the appointment of delegates from Connecticut, calls it the *2d pillar*, and the appointment by Rhode-Island is called the *3d pillar*, &c. &c.—In discussing the objects of the proposed convention *at Hartford*, Mr. Russell introduces the following remarks:

"To the cry of *disunion* and *separation* of the States, there is a very plain and obvious answer: *the States are already separated, the bond of union is already broken;*—broken by *you, Mr. Madison, and the short sighted selfish politicians who compose your councils;* all that we see in them and in you, are the convulsions *which precede dissolution.* The New England delegates may *aid in the arrangement of the succession*, but they cannot, if they would, *arrest the progress of the death.*"

"The convention must report to their constituents on the subject of peace or war; and if they find war is to continue, it is to be hoped that they will recommend *that no men or money shall be permitted to go out of New England*, until the militia expenses already incurred are reimbursed; nor until the most ample provision is made for the defence *of the New England States during the continuance of the war;* they will be justified before God and man for so doing.

"If the New England States determine to pay no money, and send forth no men, while the war continues, until their own defence is provided for, they may save themselves."

It is to be hoped that the convention will see fit to propose a more general convention of the States, including *all North of the Potomac*, for the purpose of *forming a new confederation*, grounded on experience; without, however, excluding the Southern *Atlantic* States. We always did feel, and we continue to feel, that the Northern States and Southern *Atlantic* States, have a community of interests and a natural dependence on each other."

In the Centinel of the 7th December, 1814, it is said: "there are men who know that our troubles are not *the offspring of this war alone, and will not die with it.*"

December 10, 1814:—"*We must demand that no new States, with feelings and sentiments foreign to our own, shall be cut out of the distant wilds and admitted into the Union.*"

Again:—"Those who startle at the *danger of a separation*, tell us that the soil of New England is hard and sterile, &c. Do these men forget what *national energy* can do for a people? Have they not read of Holland? Do they not remember that it threw off the yoke of Spain, (our Virginia,) and its chapels became churches, and its poor men's cottages princes' palaces?

In the Centinel of the 17th December—

"*Our course is so easy and plain*, that I know not how the most timid can pause at the entrance upon it. It gives us *the start of the Southern States*, finds employments for our impoverished mechanics, brings revenue to our treasury, spreads activity and wealth through the country. A PEACE WITH ENGLAND FOR A SINGLE YEAR, WOULD BRING EVERY STATE EAST OF VIRGINIA INTO OUR CONFEDERACY."

"*A strict neutrality* will give only *temporary relief. It leaves government to make peace for us, and with that peace, such as it will be, it holds us in their power.*"

"It will then be *too late to demand alterations in the representation and security to our rights as the only conditions upon which we will adhere to the Union.*"

"It is said, that to make a treaty of commerce with the enemy is to violate the Constitution and sever the Union: are they not both already virtually destroyed? Or in what stage of existence would *we* be, should we declare a neutrality, or even withhold taxes and men? Let us leave it to the schools to put this question to rest, while we are guarding the honor and independence of New England."

"By a commercial treaty with England, "which shall provide for the admission of such "States as may wish to come into it, and which "shall prohibit England from making a treaty "with the South and West, which does not "grant us at least equal privileges with herself, "our commerce will be secured, OUR STANDING "IN THE NATION RAISED TO ITS PROPER LEVEL. "If peace leaves us at the mercy of the West-"ern States, we may dream of freedom, but we "shall be in bonds."

"We must no longer suffer our liberties to be made the sport of theorists, the subjects of speculation of men of cold hearts and muddy understandings: neither allow that region of the west which was a wilderness when New England wrought the Independence of America, to wrest from us those blessings which we permitted them to share."

It would require volumes to contain all that might be quoted of the same character from the papers of New England, which were the mere outlets from the grand reservoir, the Boston Centinel. How exactly do these sentiments accord with those expressed in the letter to Harris, in relation to the respect felt for our government! But the chief purpose of presenting these quotations is to show, that in 1814, there was a real conspiracy organized to sever the Union, and in time of a *foreign war* to commence a *civil war*, deluge our country with the blood of brother spilled by brothers' hands, spread desolation over the fair land, and blot out of existence the only sanctuary of free principles in the universe. Such was the conspiracy during the late war for obtaining influence and power over the nation, and the Boston Centinel was their grand organ and most effective agent.

These things happened in 1813-14-15. Mr. Adams came into the State Department actively in September 1817, and one of his first POLITICAL ACTS was, to constitute this very Boston Centinel, by special favor, the organ of the government of the United States to promulgate its official proceedings to the American people! and this, too, at the expense of the patriotic editor of another paper who had labored during that perilous period for his country and for liberty.

The employment to promulgate the laws and other acts of the government, was chiefly va-

luable as an evidence of the approbation and confidence of the administration, and in this respect grateful to the feelings of a patriotic citizen who had done much service for the country—but it was snatched from him by the calculating and cold ingratitude of Mr. Adams, and given as an evidence of his sympathetic affection for the New England conspirators, just emerging from sedition and rebellion against their country.

It is not the peculium given for this service that can be regarded, but when the faithful are degraded by a withdrawal of confidence, and the wicked are rewarded by special marks of it, there must be something "*rotten in Denmark.*" We have seen one illustrious and decayed family struggling for a continuation of power by "turning democrats," or rather demagogues, and others in the last resort recommending open "rebellion," and ready to annihilate heaven and earth "rather than fail of carrying their point," and both successfully rising into power and authority over the heads of the best of patriots and most faithful public benefactors.

Many other intervening incidents of the same character might be noticed; but let us pass on to the inauguration.—It was not my purpose to discuss the election in this place; let it suffice to say, we now find "the continuation of power in the same family," and this "continuation" accomplished "by corruption," as *predicted* by Mr. John Adams in 1789, and which, with no slight opportunity of knowing the truth, I do most religiously believe was the fact. Mr. Adams ascends the inaugural chair, and proclaims a general amnesty for all political offences, and more especially to those who had so lately been "sold to the enemy by their prejudices and their ignorance." Associated with his bitterest foe, in the Administration, his republican friends, by whose indulgence he had been tolerated in their ranks for several years, find nothing but chilling repulses in his speech, and more especially in his first acts. Rufus King was his first appointment (out of the Cabinet,) the prime mover of the organized resistance to the government during the war, and the father of the system of operation afterwards adopted by the Hartford Convention! These facts have been denied; but let the public journals and records of the day be referred to.—I have before me a pamphlet written by H. G. Otis, in defence of the Hartford Convention, which he excuses mainly on the ground that other and similar measures were adopted in other parts of the United States, not less reprehensible than those by the New England States. That which evinces the strongest similitude, was a meeting held *in New York* in the month of August, 1812. Rufus King was one of the committee who drew up the following resolutions, viz:

"That we are irresistibly drawn to the conclusion, that the American people will, under "the name and form of an alliance, be submitted to the will and power of the French Emperor."

"That in this view of the subject, the question of peace or war involves all that is dear "and valuable to man on this side the grave! "We are therefore under the dire necessity of "declaring, that we have no confidence in the "men who have brought us to this perilous con "dition." They further resolved, "That representatives be chosen in the several counties—discreet men—friends of peace. The representatives can correspond or confer with each other, and co-operate with the friends of peace in our sister States, in devising and pursuing such constitutional measures as may secure our independence and preserve our Union, both of which are endangered by the present war." Such was the measure which led the way for the conspirators in Massachusetts to organize two years afterwards their convention of State delegates at Hartford.—That the prime mover in New York, and the prime agent and organ in Boston, should have been the first to receive the marks of special favor from Mr. John Q. Adams, is abundant proof that his democracy has been merely affected.

But it is not from all that we have exhibited merely, nor from his attachment to the most obnoxious of the federal leaders in the Reign of Terror, and in the days of the New England Conspiracy, that the insincerity of Mr. Adams' sudden conversion to republicanism is to be inferred:—We perceive it, in the licentious exercise of his patronage, prostituted from its design of promoting the public good to the purposes of mercenary reward to the worst of men for political services. We perceive the very doctrine avowed in his "*Publicola*," re-asserted in his first message to Congress;—in the former, it is alleged that "all power ought *to be delegated by the people*, for their own benefit," and in the latter, that "the representative should not be palsied by the will of his constituents:"—We perceive all the old doctrines of implied powers repeated and even surpassed.—We see unnecessary embassies got up, to establish *political* connexions with other countries, contrary to the advice and policy of Washington and Jefferson:—We see him and the principal functionaries of his cabinet, whose duty it is to attend to the public concerns, engaged in traversing the Union like electioneering demagogues, attending festivals and barbacues, making stump speeches, and striving to court the people to their favor:—We see the President, through his friends in Congress, opposing such an alteration of the constitution as would give the people the power of electing their Chief Magistrate, and this in direct violation of pledges publicly tendered to the nation before his election:—And we see in operation a demoralizing system of misleading the people through the influence of mercenary and corrupt editors of newspapers. Who then can doubt that John Q. Adams never has been, nor is now, worthy to be trusted as a republican? Who can avoid thinking, that the safety of our country, and the future destiny of free institutions demand at the hands of the American people, that his ill-gotten power should be taken from him, according to the form of a constitution whose spirit he has violated?

It may be remarked, in conclusion, that much more has been shown, than was necessary to the justification of the Doylestown resolution. That resolution was in its phraseology and spirit tempered with a moderation and a scrupulous regard to truth, suited to the magnitude and solemnity of the subject. Have we not *proved*, incontestibly, that "Mr. Adams *affected* to be

come a republican in 1807," merely to answer the purposes of his own vile ambition? Have we not *disproved* the sycophantic and disingenuous allegation of Jonathan Roberts, that "*Mr. Adams was always a republican in the true sense of that term?*"

Our appeal is to THE PEOPLE, whose answer, we confidently predict, will, a second time, vindicate the principles of democracy, and drive back into private life the man whom popular suffrages never would have drawn from it.

APPENDIX.

Letter of John Quincy Adams, addressed to Levitt Harris, Esq. Charge d'Affaires of the United States, St. Petersburg.

GHENT, 16*th November*, 1814.

DEAR SIR,—I have just now the pleasure of receiving your favor of 14-26 October, and am happy to learn from yourself, the confirmation of your recovery; of which, and of your illness, I had a few since been informed by a letter from my wife.

Near the close of the month of August, it was our expectation that the negotiation here would have terminated in a very few days. It soon after became apparent that the intention of the British government was to keep it open, and to shape its demands according to the course of events in Europe and in America. The policy still continues to pervade the British Cabinet. Nothing decisive is yet known to them to have occurred, either at Vienna, or in the other hemisphere, and accordingly they temporize still. Unless something should happen to fix their wavering pretensions and purposes, it will belong to the American government alone to bring our business to a point. This on their part would certainly be an honorable and spirited course of conduct, and I should have no doubt of its being pursued, if THE DESIRE OF PEACE WERE NOT PARAMOUNT TO EVERY OTHER CONSIDERATION.

The occurrences of the war in America have been of a diversified nature. Success and defeat have alternately attended the arms of both belligerents, and hitherto have left them nearly where they were at the commencement of the campaign. It has been on our part merely defensive, with the single exception of the taking of Fort Erie, with which it began. The battles of Chippewa and of Bridgewater—the defence of Fort Erie on the 15th of August, and the naval action upon Lake Champlain on the 11th of September, have redounded to our glory as well as to our advantage—while the loss of Washington, the capitulations of Alexandria and of Washington county, Massachusetts, and of Nantucket, have been more disgraceful to us than injurious. THE DEFENCE OF BALTIMORE HAS GIVEN US LITTLE MORE TO BE PROUD OF THAN THE DEMONSTRATION AGAINST IT HAS AFFORDED TO OUR ENEMY. PREVOST'S RETREAT FROM PLATTSBURG HAS BEEN MORE DISGRACEFUL TO THEM THAN HONORABLE TO US; AND WELLINGTON'S VETERANS, THE FIRE-EATER BRISBANE, AND THE FIREBRAND COCKBURN, HAVE KEPT THE RAWEST OF OUR MILITIA IN COUNTENANCE, BY THEIR EXPERTNESS IN THE ART OF RUNNING AWAY. The general issue of the campaign is yet to come; and THERE IS TOO MUCH REASON TO APPREHEND THAT IT WILL BE UNFAVORABLE TO OUR SIDE.

Left, by a concurrence of circumstances unexampled in the annals of the world, to struggle alone and friendless against THE WHOLE COLOSSAL POWER OF GREAT BRITAIN—fighting in reality against her for the cause of all Europe, with all Europe coldly looking on, basely bound not to raise in our favor a helping hand, secretly wishing us success, and not daring so much as to cheer us in the strife, what could be expected from the first furies of this unequal conflict, but disaster and discomfiture to us! DIVIDED AMONG OURSELVES MORE IN PASSIONS THAN INTEREST, WITH HALF THE NATION SOLD BY THEIR PREJUDICES AND THEIR IGNORANCE TO OUR ENEMY, WITH A FEEBLE AND PENURIOUS GOVERNMENT, WITH FIVE FRIGATES FOR A NAVY, AND SCARCELY FIVE EFFICIENT REGIMENTS FOR AN ARMY, HOW CAN IT BE EXPECTED THAT WE SHOULD RESIST THE MASS OF FORCE WHICH THAT GIGANTIC POWER HAS COLLECTED TO CRUSH US AT A BLOW?

This too is the moment which he has chosen to break through all the laws of war acknowledged and respected by civilized nations. Under the false pretence of retaliation, Cochrane has formally declared the determination to destroy and lay waste all the towns on the sea coast which may be assailable. The ordinary horrors of war are mildness and mercy in comparison with what British vengeance and malice have denounced upon us. We must go through it all—I trust in God we shall rise in triumph over it all:—but the first shock is the most terrible part of the process, and it is that which we are now enduring.

The Transit will probably sail about the beginning of next month from Bordeaux. Your despatches by Mr. Forbes will go in her, if we get them in time. I have heard nothing from Count Nesselrode. The Congress at Vienna has scarcely yet opened:—but all the important arrangements are made, and there is no doubt that the termination will be pacific.

I am, with high regard and consideration, dear sir, your very humble and obedient servant,

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER AGAIN AT ITS *TRICKS*.

Among the curiosities to which the present canvass has given birth, is a table in the National Intelligencer, which represents that, by apportioning the votes for each candidate to the number of votes given to him in each State,—

Adams would have had	93.69	votes.
Jackson - - - - -	85.83	
Crawford - - - - -	47 23	
Clay - - - - -	27.70	
	259r45	

And that by apportioning the votes for each candidate to the number of votes given to him in each State, reduced to three fifths on account of colored representation;

Adams would have had	96.22	votes.
Jackson - - - - -	75.02	
Crawford - - - - -	39.25	
Clay - - - - -	26.43	

It is not enough to reply to the Intelligencer

that Mr. Adams, in his letter to the Committee appointed to notify him of his election, said,

"All my predecessors in the high station to which the favor of the House now calls me, have been honored with majorities of the electoral voices in their primary colleges. It has been my fortune to be placed, by the divisions of sentiment prevailing among our countrymen on this occasion, in competition, friendly and honorable, with three of my fellow citizens, all justly enjoying, in eminent degrees, the public favor; and of whose worth, talents, and services, no one entertains a higher and more respectful sense than myself. The names of two of them were, in the fulfilment of the provisions of the Constitution, presented to the selection of the House, in concurrence with my own—names closely associated with the glory of the nation; and one of them further recommended by a larger minority of the primary electoral suffrages than mine."

We will examine this table, which the Intelligencer says, is made up from the official detailed returns, on file in the State Department, by one of the most scientific men of the age; and which Messrs. Gales and Seaton verify to be accurate, to the very lowest fraction.

The first statement, which apportions the votes given to the several candidates, and which allows Mr. Adams 98.69, and General Jackson only 85.82, is false upon its face. The whole world knows, that the number of electoral votes was 262; yet, by this calculation, the sum of all the votes given to all the candidates, is reduced to 259.45.

We do not know who is the scientific author of this calculation; but, if we are rightly informed, he is a Clerk in the State Department, a foreigner in birth and principles, who seeks promotion by servile adulation, and who, to please the present incumbents, said that Gen. Jackson was a blood-thirsty murderer, and would be condemned to be hung by any impartial jury, for the execution of the "six militiamen." Such is the man whose calculations the Intelligencer introduces to the public, by an editorial article, declaring that "they will stand the test of the severest scrutiny."

Mr. Adams received in Maine 9—in New Hampshire 8—in Vermont 7—in Massachusetts 15—in Rhode Island 4—in Connecticut 8—in New York 26—in Delaware 1—in Maryland 3—in Louisiana 2—in Illinois 1. Votes 84.

Gen. Jackson received in New York 1—in New Jersey 8—in Pennsylvania 28—in Maryland 7—in North Carolina 15—in South Carolina 11—in Tennessee 11—in Louisiana 3—in Mississippi 3—in Indiana 5—in Alabama 5—in Illinois 2. Votes 99.

Being a majority of electoral votes in eleven States, and a plurality of 15 votes over Mr. Adams, the next highest candidate. All the votes given to Gen. Jackson, except the 11 votes in South Carolina, the 2 votes in Louisiana, and 1 vote in New York, were given to him by the people. Whereas, the Intelligencer, speaking of the 26 votes given to Mr. Adams in New York, says as follows:

From the National Intelligencer, of Nov. 23, 1824.

"If, in addition to all this, an imposition had not been practised upon the country by the decision in the Legislature of New York, he [Mr. Adams] would not now be the second on the list of candidates."

From the same, November 25, 1824.

"It is a saying which we never much admired, as applied to political questions, that those who are not for us are against us. The Legislature of New York, by their decision, have given a new reading to it, which we like still less, viz: that those who are against us are for us. It only has been upon this principle that they decided that 78 was a majority of 157.—Let no one suppose that we object to this decision merely because of the great injustice which it has effected in the particular case in which it occurred. We take, it is true, some concern in that, but we feel a much deeper interest in the purity of our elections—in the keeping them free from the pollution of CORRUPTION, TRICK, AND ARTIFICE."

From the National Intelligencer, of Nov. 25, 1824:

"Our readers are already apprized of the scenes of insolence and outrage under which the late decision was made in the Legislature of New York, in regard to her Electoral votes.—The tone of the ultra federal prints corresponds with the spirit of these scenes."

From the same, November 30, 1824.

"With due deference to the contrary opinion of the Editors of the Statesman, we have supposed that the United States at large, had some small concern in the Presidential election."

"If this be admitted, it requires no argument to prove that an error or FRAUD in the election of electors in any one of the States, affects the whole of the States, and that every citizen, of whatever State, has a moral as well as legal right to express an opinion upon it."

From the same, December 9, 1824.

"The Blank Ballots.—The decision in the Legislature of New York, by which it has been declared that less than one half is a majority of any given number of capita, has excited as much surprise every where else, apparently, as it did in our minds."

From the National Intelligencer, of Dec. 8, 1824

"The more the subject shall be investigated, the more conclusively will it appear that the twenty-five electors favorable to Mr. Adams, were not chosen by a majority."

"It is no argument against exposing an act of usurpation, in so important a concern, that there is now no remedy for it, should it appear, as we believe it will, that such is the case."

Upon such data as is thus described by the Intelligencer, that paper now attempts to say that Mr. Adams received a greater number of the votes of the people of the United States, and gives a table which deducts from General Jackson's vote, on account of the three-fifths for colored representation, so as to reduce his vote below that given to Mr. Adams!

We are sometimes compelled almost to loath the pen and the press, when we see the prostituted uses to which they are applied.

The slave holding States in which General Jackson received the electoral votes, were North and South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee and Maryland. Mr. Adams received a part of the vote of Louisiana and Maryland, and taking the other States, and look-

ing to the census, we can easily see the number of votes given to General Jackson on account of the colored population in those States.

Each State is entitled to one vote for each Representative and Senator to which it is entitled in the National Legislature. Thus Illinois is entitled to three votes.—And why? Because she has two votes on account of her being a sovereign State, and one on account of her population.

The true method, then, of ascertaining the number of votes given to Gen. Jackson, on account of colored representation, is first to deduct two, the votes allotted to each State on account of its sovereignty as a State, from the whole number of votes allotted to that State, and then deduct from the remainder, the number of votes allotted to such State on account of its white population. The remainder will exhibit the allowance for colored population.—Thus, the free white population of Mississippi in 1820, was 42,176—her black population, was 32,814. Mississippi had three votes, two because of her right as a sovereign State, and one on account of her white population. 40,000 being the ratio, she had an excess of 2,176 whites, and 32,814 blacks, unrepresented in the electoral college. Yet the calculation of the scientific Clerk of the State Department, which Mr. Gales has endorsed to stand the test of the severest scrutiny, reduces Gen Jackson's vote in Mississippi, from 3 to 2.50, on account of colored representation!!

We believe that, leaving Maryland and Louisiana out of view, and as to Gen. Jackson and Mr. Adams, the difference is but a fraction: by doing so, the number of votes received by Gen. Jackson on account of colored representation, is as follows:

	Whites.	Blacks.	Whole No. votes.	For State sovereignty.	For white population.	For black population.
N. C.	419.200	205.027	15	2	10.48	2.52
S. C.	231.812	251.783	11	2	5.79	3.21
Alab.	85.451	41.879	5	2	2.38	62
Miss.	42 176	32.824	3	2	1.	
Ten.	339.777	80.107	11	2	8.49	51
			45	10	23.14	6.86

Thus it will be seen, that instead of reducing the vote given to the General, on account of colored population, to 75.02, we can only deduct on that account 6.86, which leaves his electoral vote, exclusive of the colored representation, 92.14—making it 8.14 of *white* votes higher than the vote given to Mr. A. without taking into the calculation the vote *illegally*, as Mr. Gales has said, obtained in New York. Deduct these 26 votes from the vote given to Mr. Adams, and General Jackson's majority of *white* votes will be 34.14. So much, then, for the votes given to General Jackson, on account of slave representation.

The fallacy of all the reasoning upon this subject, appears by the fact, that Gen. Jackson received more of the people's votes than Mr. Adams, notwithstanding the number of votes was reduced, by the slave population in the Southern States, about one fourth. This appears fully, from the following extract from the address of the convention of friends of General Jackson, held in Baltimore, and published in this paper of June 1827, which never has yet been contradicted.—Here is the extract.

Extract from the address of the Baltimore Jackson Convention.

"Mr. Adams at the last election in the House of Representatives, received the votes of five of the Western States. In the nine Western States General Jackson received twenty-nine electoral votes, and Mr. Adams only three; but one of which was from the people, whereas twenty-six of the Jackson electors were chosen immediately by the people themselves. The returns of the *popular* votes in the nine Western States, as contained in the papers printed at the time, and not contradicted, are as follows, viz:

	Jackson.	*Adams.*	*Clay.*	*Crawford.*
Ohio,	18,487	12,280	19,255	
Kentucky,	6,455		16,782	
Alabama,	9,443	2,416	67	1,680
Indiana,	7,343	3,095	5,315	
Tennessee,	20.197	216		312
Mississippi,	3,254	1,694		119
Illinois,	1,901	1,542	1,047	219
Missouri,	987	311	1,401	
Total,	68,067	21,555	43,867	2,339

From the above returns it appears, that of the votes of the people in the nine Western States, General Jackson received 46,512 votes more than Mr. Adams—24,201 more than Mr. Clay—2645 more than Mr. Clay and Adams together, and 315 more than the whole received by all three of the opposing candidates. Suppose the contest to have laid between Mr. Adams and General Jackson, and the votes confined to those two, is there any one, who looks at the above statement of the actual votes received by Mr. Adams, and reflects that Mr. Clay's friends had industriously represented Mr. Adams as unfriendly to *western* interests, and that a President ought not again to be taken from the *cabinet*, is there any one, we repeat, who will venture to say that Mr Adams would have got one fourth of the votes of the nine western States? And yet he received the votes of five states in Congress, and General Jackson only four.

The following are the results of the votes, of such states as are not contained in the above list, taken from the papers printed at the close of the Presidential election. They cannot vary far from the official returns.

	Adams.	*Jackson.*	*Crawford.*	*Clay.*
Maine,	6,870		2,330	
Massachus.	30,687		6,616	
Connecticut	7,587		1,978	
Rhode Island	2,145		200	
N Hampshire	4,107		643	
Virginia	3,189	2,851	8,489	416
New Jersey	9,110	10,985	1,196	
Pennsylvania	5,440	36,109	4,206	1,690
N. Carolina		20,415	15,621	
Maryland	14,632	14,523	3,646	695
	83,767	84,881	44,973	2,801
Add W. S.	21,555	68,067	2,330	43,867
Total U. S.	105,322	152,951	47,305	46,668

From this table, it appears that General Jackson's majority of the popular vote, so far as taken throughout the United States, over Mr. Adams, was 47,629, and over both Adams and Clay 961."

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, JULY 19, 1828. No. 19.

GEN. JACKSON'S QUALIFICATIONS AS A LEGISLATOR.

We have had several numbers on this subject in the National Intelligencer, under the signature of Henry. Our notice of the palpable suppression, which we characterized as a forgery, has drawn forth, in the Intelligencer an abusive article admitting the suppression charged, and an abandonment by the writer of the attempt to make General Jackson responsible for the ordinance of the City Council of St. Augustine, further than that he had passed an Ordinance organizing the City Council.

But hear him, he says:

"1. *I am accused of "fraud" or "profligate forgery."*

The ground for this accusation is worthy of attention. It will be recollected that I submitted to the public *an Ordinance* enacted by Gov. Jackson, No. 1, and dated the *18th July*, 1821, creating the Government of Mayor and Council of St. Augustine, rendering these officers annually reappointable by himself, and investing them with *unlimited* power over *life, liberty and property*. It will also be recollected that this City Council, under authority thus given by Governor Jackson, actually exercised some of the powers with which they had been invested; and by *an Ordinance*, dated the *17th October*, 1821, imposed upon the People of St. Augustine, taxes of unprecedented magnitude, and enforced their collection with vigorous exactness. It will, at the same time, be recollected, that, although I did not charge Gov. Jackson with having *enacted* the Ordinance of the City Council, I yet considered him as justly responsible for the severity of its provisions, because it emanated from his delegated authority; because he had no right to delegate authority to impose taxes; and because he gave to the acts of the Council the forcible sanction of silent acquiescence.

The writer proceeds to say, that we suppressed Ordinance, No. 1, passed by Gen. Jackson. As we did not read the first numbers of Henry, we do not know what Ordinance No. 1 contained—nor was the reading of it connected with the subject matter before us. Henry had undertaken to prove that Gen. Jackson was not well qualified to act as a Legislator, and as an evidence thereof, quoted an act of Congress, repealing an Ordinance enacted by him. Did Henry expect the people to believe that the Ordinance repealed related to the Ordinance of the City Council? He did. How did he attempt to produce that impression? By quoting the act of Congress, and suppressing the title of the ordinance of the 18th of July, 1821, enacted by General Jackson, and repealed by the act of Congress, and giving *at large*, the entire ordinance of the Mayor and Council of the city of St. Augustine, of 17th October, and all that part of the act of Congress which relates to it.

Henry now pretends that the title of the ordinance enacted by Gen. Jackson was omitted because it was too much labor for him to write it out!! But hear him! he says:

II. *I am accused of "an intentional suppression of a material part of a law pretendedly given to the public entire, and of having been* IMPELLED BY MOTIVES *not less fraudulent than the man who commits a forgery on a note of hand or of a Bank note for fraudulent purposes."*

This charge, like the preceding, has emanated from the magnifying optics of the Editor. The simple fact is this: in transcribing, for the reader's convenience, an act of Congress which was *appended as a note*, the *title* of an irrelevant ordinance was omitted, and an "&c." was substituted in its place. The insertion of the "&c." (a fact which the Editor, with customary adroitness, *conceals*) was a sufficient intimation, that, in the opinion of the writer, the *title* omitted was not deemed material; and that the reader, if he thought differently, might consult the act itself.

Now the words omitted were "for the naturalization of the inhabitants of the ceded territories," and were not only relevant, but absolutely necessary to a right understanding of the act. If Henry had intended that those who wished to understand his article should refer to the act itself, why did he omit the only line in the act which was relevant to the subject that he was pretending to discuss, in an essay which made two columns (we believe) in a newspaper? The subject was Gen. Jackson's qualifications as a legislator. The ordinance of the City Council was quoted as an evidence of *his* legislation, and the act of Congress was referred to, to prove that Congress had condemned it.—No one can doubt that the suppression was *intentional!* No one can persuade us that a man retained as a post office pimp, *(or a clerk whose duty it is to copy* the *Senate* JOURNALS,) would be so much fatigued in copying an act of Congress as to substitute an &c. for the title of an act, if his employers were not interested in the substitution.

We have already explained the reason why the ordinance of July 18th, was repealed. Even Henry does not complain of *that* ordinance. He still attempts to make General Jackson responsible for the ordinance of the City Council, and with this view, asserts,

"The act quoted by the Editor (by us) declares, that in addition to the *two expressly* enumerated ordinances, viz: one 'providing for the naturalization of the inhabitants,' numbered "*Three;*" the other "imposing and laying certain taxes on the inhabitants," "all *other laws,* ORDINANCES, and *resolves*, so far as they *enforce* or *confirm* THE SAME, be, and the same are hereby, repealed, and declared null and void."

The reasoning by which this is attempted, is like most of the efforts to destroy the well

deserved popularity of General Jackson. "*It will be recollected, that this City Council, under authority thus given by Governor Jackson, actually exercised some of the powers with which they had been invested,*" *says this extraordinary logician!!* General Jackson, under his powers of Governor, had organized the City Council, and the City Council had passed an ordinance!! Therefore, General Jackson is responsible for —what? not his own act, but one of the City Council.

Now upon the same parity of reasoning, Mr. Adams is made responsible for this ordinance. Mr. Adams drew up the act of Congress vesting General Jackson with the powers of Governor, and therefore Mr. Adams is responsible for his acts as Governor, would be an argument much more appropriate than this.

But it is absurd to argue such a point. The ordinance of the City Council was passed on the 17th of October, 1821. It is not known that General Jackson ever was at St. Augustine, and it does not appear that the ordinance was ever submitted to his revision.

Gen. Jackson's eloquent address to the inhabitants of Florida is dated October 8th, and he left Pensacola about that date. On his arrival at Nashville, sent in his resignation.

Niles' Register—vol. 21, Dec. 1, 1821—page 214, says:

"Gov. Jackson has arrived at Nashville where he was received by his fellow citizens with the highest marks of respect:

The same paper of Dec. 5, 1821—p. 256, says:

"Gen. Jackson. It is positively stated that Gen. Jackson has resigned the government of the Floridas—but the fact is not announced at Washington."

And the same authority of Dec. 29, 1821—vol. 21—p. 287, states:

"Gen. Jackson. It is positively stated that his resignation, as Governor of the Floridas, has been received by the President of the United States."

It thus appears that Gen. Jackson is not responsible for this exercise of the authority granted by his ordinance, unless he, in its enactment, exceeded the powers vested in him by his commission and the act of Congress.—We have already said that we have not read the ordinance, and after the sample of suppression of which we have convicted Henry, we cannot consent to take his version of it as true, for he who would wilfully suppress a material part of an act for the purpose of slanderously charging upon General Jackson an ordinance, which, from aught that "Henry" appears to know, he never read, would not hesitate to give a false version, *although he may happen to be a clerk in a public office, charged with copying official journals, or the supervision of confidential correspondence.*

Having answered so much of Henry's attack upon General Jackson as merits notice, at this time, it only remains for us to show what were the powers vested in him as Governor of Florida and the manner in which they were discharged.

By the act of Congress, of the 3d of March, 1821, the President was authorized to appoint a Governor of East and West Florida, and the person so appointed was vested with all the military, civil and *judicial* powers exercised by the existing government of the same. In virtue of this act, Mr. Monroe on the 10th of March, did commission General Jackson, and vested him with "*all the power and authority heretofore exercised by the Governor and Captain General and intendant of Cuba,* and by the Governors of East and West Florida."

What were the extent of these powers is unknown, because they were undefined, and are believed to be limited by the absolute and undisputed will of the Governor himself.

The style of General Jackson's proclamation has been ridiculed, and these words have been cited as an evidence of his love of absolute power. Let it be remembered, that, that proclamation was addressed to the inhabitants of Florida who had been under the command of the Governor and superintendant of Cuba, and that the citation of his powers was intended to make known to the people of Florida, the extent of the powers vested in him by law.

Let it also be remembered, that the words cited, refer to the act of Congress drawn up by Mr. Adams, and are a literal transcript, from the commission signed by Mr. Monroe and written by John Q. Adams then Secretary of State.

But we are not left to conjecture for Gen. Jackson's opinions of those powers, nor of the manner in which they were exercised. In Niles Register we find the following extract from the Floridian.

Pensacola, September 22.

"Before Mr. Mitchell pronounced the opinion of the court on the question of jurisdiction (in the case of the heirs of Vidal vs. John Innerarity) Governor Jackson made several remarks worthy of himself, and which deserve to be recorded, but the following is so perfectly characteristic, that we should be inexcusable in withholding it from our readers

He said, "I am clothed with powers, that no one, under a republic, ought to possess, and which I trust will never again be given to any man—nothing will afford me more happiness than to learn that Congress in its wisdom, shall have distributed them properly, and in such manner as is consonant to our earliest and dearest impressions—yet as I hold these powers, by the authority of an act of Congress, and Commissioned from the President of the U. S. it therefore becomes my imperious duty to discharge the sacred trust reposed in me, according to my best abilities, even tho' the proper exercise of the powers given, might involve me in heavy personal responsibilities.

It has been my fortune, to be thus circumstanced on other occasions, in my various relationships as a public servant—yet I never have, nor never will shrink from the discharge of my public duties, from any apprehension of personal responsibility."

It will here be seen that Gen Jackson was vested with this dangerous power by the act of Mr. Adams; and it will also appear that he exercised it under a proper sense of the high responsibility imposed upon him.

Henry further attempts to injure Gen. Jackson, by asserting, that he "banished citizens of Pensacola, for the alleged crime of being spies in time of peace, or aliens in their native land."

Is Henry ignorant of the character of the act referred to? Or has he wilfully misstated the fact, to make a new charge against General Jackson? Are the Editors of the Intelligencer so much electrified at the loss of the Senate's printing? Or is the Mayor so much engaged in speculations, to retrieve his desperate fortunes, that he has forgotten it?

The persons banished, were not citizens of Florida. They were Spanish officers, who by the treaty, negociated by Mr Adams, were required to leave the territory. By the courtesy of Governor Jackson, they were permitted to remain in Pensacola after the period designated by *Mr. Adams* for their departure, and the cause of the order commanding them to leave the territory, was a contempt of the judicial character of Governor Jackson, in the case of Callava.

Of one of these men, Mr. Niles says:

"It appears that one of the Spanish officers who lately signed a protest against the proceedings of General Jackson, was actually serving as a guide to the British, in the "demonstration" on New Orleans, in 1814, 15, though a native of Louisiana."

The act against which the Spanish officers protested, was the order of Governor Jackson, compelling Colonel Callava to deliver certain papers, involving the title to the property of orphan children; the attempt to withhold which, an article in Niles' Register charges, "was for purposes of private profit, and unfair speculation."

It is thus that our opponents are driven to the adoption of open fraud, and the advocacy of the most unprincipled men and actions.

But the Editors of the Intelligencer will have full cause to repent their attack upon General Jackson. Desperate in their pecuniary condition, destitute of political or moral honesty, they have lent themselves to the support of the re-election of John Quincy Adams as the only means of prolonging a miserable, political existence. Their secret workings are well understood and when the excitement of the present moment shall have passed away, those who now use them, will shrink from their touch, as from a putrid mass whose contact engenders a destroying fever.

We are now told that Mr. Fendall is not the writer of Henry. This may be true. So far as the Intelligencer is concerned, it matters not who is the writer. So far as Mr. Fendall is concerned we are gratified to learn that he is not. He has sins enough of his own to answer for, and being a mere Swiss, employed in foreign service, we trust he has not the malignity which characterizes the writer of Henry.

GEN. JACKSON AND THE FLORIDAS.

We have given extracts, which prove that Mr. Adams himself drew up the commission vesting Gen. J. with the powers claimed, and we also publish at large, in this No. of the Extra Telegraph, Mr. Adams's letter in relation to all Governor Jackson's acts.

We invite a careful perusal of it, and the friends of Gen. Jackson throughout the United States will find in it an ample defence of his public conduct justificatory of their determination to bestow upon him the highest honor in the gift of a free people. But the Editors of the National Intelligencer, and their correspondent Henry, have endeavored to ridicule the *style* of Gen. Jackson's Proclamation, and have attempted to draw from it an inference that he is fond of power. By referring to the document No. 1, entitled "Documents accompanying the Message of the President of the United States to both Houses at the opening of the seventeenth Congress, December 5th 1821;" printed by Gales & Seaton, by order of the Senate, page 32—the Editors of the Intelligencer will find the letter of instructions written by Mr. Adams to Gov. Jackson, dated 12th March, 1821, from which the following is an extract, viz:

"As soon as the possession [of the Floridas, "shall be transferred, you will in pursuance of "your authority over the ceded Territories, "issue proclamations announcing the fact—— "*a form adopted from that which was issued on* "*the first occupation of Louisiana is herewith* "*enclosed to be modified as the circumstances in* "*your opinion may require.*"

On page 37 of the same document, the form is given, as follows:

"Form of a Proclamation."

"By Major General Andrew Jackson, Gov- "ernor of the Provinces of the Floridas, *exer-* "*cising the powers of the Captain General and* "*Intendant of the Island of Cuba, over the said* "*Provinces and of the Governors of said Provin-* "*ces respectively.*"

Thus it is again found that the words, for using which the Editors of the Intelligencer have ridiculed and denounced Gen. Jackson, are copied, verbatim, from a form given in a letter of instructions, written by John Quincy Adams, as Secretary of State.

What are we next to expect from a party, who, having thrice told their confuted slanders, are driven to the expedient of charging upon Gen. Jackson, as an evidence of his want of fitness for the Presidency, the acts of their own favorite candidate, John Q. Adams.

We tender our thanks to the Intelligencer for the zeal with which it has lately entered into this contest. They have now thrown off all disguise, and can fabricate or publish slanders with as much facility as the most abandoned of their crew.

General Jackson to the Secretary of State.

Nashville, *January* 22, 1822.

Sir: Your letter of the 1st instant reached me a few days since, in which you advise me of the receipt of mine of the 22d November, with its enclosures. I had also the honor to receive a copy of your communication, dated 2d November, to the minister of Spain, together with the translations of two letters from said minister, addressed to the Secretary of State, and transmitted to me by direction of the President of the United States. You inform me that the definitive answer to these letters will be deferred until you shall have the opportunity of obtaining my reply, with any remarks I may be disposed to make, on the communications of the minister of Spain.

I sincerely regret that Don Joaquin de Anduaga's letter of the 22d November, had not been transmitted at an earlier period, as it will be

necessary, in my reply, to refer you to two communications of Capt. Bell, of the 31st July and 4th August last, and to Mr. Worthington's letters on the subject of the archives at St. Augustine; the first of which are on the file in the Executive office at Pensacola, and the last I forwarded to you when I was informed by Dr. Bronaugh that my resignation was accepted, on the 1st ultimo, not expecting to have any further use for them. Immediately on the receipt of your letter, however, I wrote Mr. Worthington, requesting him to forward you certified copies of his communications as promptly as practicable, and have adopted the same measure in relation to those of Captain Bell, although I had been advised that he had transmitted duplicates to you from St. Augustine. To these documents I must refer you, relying upon my answers thereto, and my own recollection, for their contents, and accompanying my reply with such vouchers as are within my reach, believing there will be ample testimony in your possession to enable you to rebut the statements of this minister of the Spanish government.

Upon the subject of seizing the papers at St. Augustine, you observe that the Spanish minister dwells with much earnestness on the agreement which had been made between Colonel Butler and the late Governer Coppinger concerning these papers, and requests to be informed whether this agreement was known to me at the time the order was issued for demanding an receiving them; and, if so, to state the particular grounds on which I judged it necessary to resort to compulsory measures for obtaining possession of them.

In answer to this inquiry, I have the honor respectfully to state, that Colonel Butler, the commissioner appointed to receive the transfer of East Florida from the Spanish government, reached me on the 8th of August last, at Pensacola, and made his report. As soon as it was submitted to my examination I was entirely satisfied that neither Coppinger on the one hand, nor Butler on the other, had any authority, either under the treaty or their instructions, to enter into such an agreement relative to the archives, which were, by a positive stipulation between the two governments, to have been delivered over, with the country, to the constituted authorities of the United States. The treaty was imperative, and vested the parties with no discretion on the subject. Believing, however, that the course adopted by Colonel Butler was perhaps the only one that could have been pursued, without the employment of force, to preserve the documents; and notwithstanding I was perfectly satisfied that Coppinger had, on his part, violated both the treaty and the order of the Captain General of Cuba, yet I felt disposed to leave the archives precisely in the same situation in which Colonel Butler had placed them, under his agreement with Coppinger. I was induced to take this course from a wish to create no unnecessary difficulties, and from a hope that the Spanish officers would comply with their arrangement, and permit the papers to remain unmolested until the arrival of the President's instructions in regard to their final disposition.

This minister states that the commissioners, Butler and Coppinger, stipulated that the artillery and archives were to remain, the first in deposite, in possession of the Anglo-American commissary, and the last where they were, and without the possibility of their being taken away to the Havanna. He does not say what was their situation, but it will be recollected that the aleade was their keeper. Nor does he tell you that Don Jose Coppinger permitted them to be picked, and culled, and taken away, in violation of his solemn pledge and agreement, as you will see by a reference being had to Capt. Bell's letters to me of the 31st July and 4th August, 1821, duplicates of which I am advised are in your possession.

When I received these letters from Capt. Bell, who exercised provisionally the powers and authorities of Secretary of East Florida, before the arrival of Mr. Worthington, I acknowledge that my indignation was very much aroused. I felt that it was my imperative duty to protect the people of Florida in the enjoyment of the right secured them expressly under the treaty. I was bound to act on the occasion. The agreement respecting the archives, although void *abinitio*, for the want of power, had been outrageously violated by Coppinger, or with his connivance; and the evidence of individual rights, secured to the citizens, were about to be fraudulently conveyed away, after he had pleged himself to Colonel Butler, that they should not be removed from that place, and should remain precisely as they were.

The verbal report of Colonel Butler, as communicated in my letter of the 4th August last, affords a clue to the motives of Colonel Coppinger, in attempting to practice this base deception. For the last six months previous to the transfer of the country, it is believed he had been engaged in issuing surreptitious grants, for large quantities of land in East Florida. It became necessary, that they should be taken to the island of Cuba, for the purpose of consummating the titles. These were, no doubt, the documents which were picked and culled from the balance, to be transported to the Havanna; as Coppinger was convinced, that the fraud would be inevitably detected, if they should be surrendered to the American authorities. This explains the reason why, and wherefore, they were not delivered over to our commissioner in the first instance; and forms the basis of the confidential communication made to Colonel Butler on the 3d of July last, advising him that a large portion of these archives, relating to private property, were packed up for removal to Cuba; and which gave rise to his letter to Colonel Coppinger of that date, as will appear by the enclosed extract, marked E.

Speaking of the correspondence between Cols. Butler and Coppinger, Don Joaquin de Anduaga remarks, that "by the before mentioned correspondence, it appears, that doubts had arisen whether the artillery, and certain archives ought, or ought not, to be delivered over to the United States." With due deference, I would ask, could any doubts exist, as to the archives, under the second article of the treaty? No. Could any doubts be entertained relative to the archives embraced in the instructions of his Catholic Majesty, or the instructions given by the captain general of Cuba, to Don Jose Coppinger, colonel, and commanding the Spanish forces at St. Augustine, and who was charged with the delivery of the country, and all

documents relating to the property and sovereignty of the country ceded? It is presumed not. In his letter to Col. Forbes of the 16th May, 1821, the captain general of Cuba says, "respecting East Florida, where there ought to be found all her archives, Governor Mahy would direct that Governor, as entrusted by him with the important commission, to make a formal delivery to Mr. Forbes, of that province, as well as of the documents belonging to it" "A similar despatch would be addressed to the commandant of West Florida." Here is a positive declaration, that such instructions were, or should be given, to Governor Coppinger, for the delivery of all the archives included in the stipulations of the treaty. Contrast this statement of the captain general of Cuba with the answer of Governor Coppinger to colonel Butler's letter to him, dated July 3d, 1821. "Confining myself," he says, "to a compliance with the treaty, and the orders of my government," (which he informed colonel Butler, verbally, prevented him from delivering the archives) "their literal sense is the only guide to my endeavour in the execution, and when any doubts arise, I consult them, with that frankness necessary to ascertain my course, and warrant my responsibility."

From this exposition, no one can fail to discover a striking contradiction between the captain general Mahy and Governor Coppinger; the former assuring Colonel Forbes, that he would direct Governor Coppinger to deliver over the documents to the American authorities, and the latter asserting, that, "as an individual, he believed, they should be given over." See E E. But, that the orders of his government prevented him from performing that duty. We can find no excuse, either for the captain general, governor Coppinger, or Colonel Callava, for not complying with the orders of their superiors, and with good faith carrying into effect the 2d article of the treaty, by delivering, and being prepared to deliver over, all the archives and documents appertaining to the property and sovereignty of the Floridas. Instead of this, the captain general does not deliver them at Cuba, Coppinger, contrary to his orders, was preparing to convey them away, in a clandestine manner, in violation of his agreement and solemn pledges, until arrested in his faithless conduct, by Colonel Butler; and Callava, whilst professing to surrender all the archives, &c. was wickedly and treacherously attempting to carry away the testamentary papers of the heirs of Vidal, and other documents, which were the evidences of claims to private property, in the country ceded to the United States.

The unjustifiable delays and evasions of the officers of Spain, in withholding the archives and documents, of which the delivery had been expressly stipulated by treaty—vouchers indispensable to the United States, for the dispensation of private justice, and the establishment of private right, but entirely useless to Spain—could not but impress upon me the belief, that they were intended to subserve the purposes of injustice, fraud, and oppression. The attempt to carry away a number of those documents from St. Augustine and Pensacola, in a clandestine manner, was considered as a flagrant violation of the treaty; and I began to entertain the opinion, that a systematic combination had been formed amongst the officers of Spain to deprive the honest citizens of the country of all the evidences of their right to property, secured to them by the provisions of the cession.

Under these impressions, and believing myself vested with legal authority to protect the rights of the citizens, I was urged, by the most imperative duty, to exercise it in their behalf. Upon the receipt of Captain Bell's letters, before referred to, advising me that the archives at St. Augustine were picked and culled to be conveyed away, I forthwith wrote him, on the 1st September, 1821, the letter herewith enclosed, marked C, of which the following is an extract:

"I have this moment received your several letters of the 31st July and 4th August, with their enclosures, and regret that the shortness of time will not permit me to answer in detail. On the subject of the archives I will barely draw your attention to the second article of the treaty with Spain, according to which all archives or documents directly relating to the *property or sovereignty* of the country, are to be delivered by her. You will, therefore, forthwith, on the receipt of this, if not already in possession of them, take them into your possession, and place them in the hands of the alcalde for safe keeping; and who aught to be, like every other, a sworn officer under the government, and not a Spanish officer, owing no allegiance to the United States. All papers and documents in the possession of the cabildo, and, in course, in the possession of American, and not Spanish functionaries, are to be retained, and none of them permitted to be culled and taken away." "I am gratified with the friendly expressions of the cabildo of St. Augustine, but am sorroy to find they have so entirely mistaken the sense of the proclamation. Nothing could be more absurd than that Spanish officers, as such, should administer the government. The true meaning is, that, whenever the incumbent will take the oath to support the constitution of the United States, and abjure that of Spain, and take the oaths of office, he shall be continued therein; that part of the proclamation which enjoins fidelity to the government of the United States would, otherwise, be nonsense, and the government has, at all times, the power to remove or dismiss him, and supply his place. But this will not be done, unless it be found that he is incompetent to his trust, or unfaithful; and whenever either is the case, this power, for the benefit of the people, ought to be exercised."

Having previously addressed Captain Bell a letter, on the 13th of August, 1821, a copy of which is enclosed, marked D, and forwarded it to him by Mr. Bird, attorney for the United States in East Florida, I was gratified to find from his answer, that, before the receipt of either of my communications, himself and Mr. Worthington had taken the steps necessary to preserve the archives, and extend to the people of East Florida that protection which was secured and guaranteed to them under the treaty.

When it is recollected that the archives and documents relating to the property and sovereignty of the Floridas, were to be transfered with the country, agreeably to the stipulations of the treaty and that Gov. Coppinger had been ordered to deliver those in East Florida, what indignation must fill every honest and hon-

rable breast, when we learn, from the letter of he keeper of these papers at St. Augustine, hat he claims them as private property, which e had acquired by purchase. From whom ould this purchase have been made? From the ing? No, because he had stipulated to surren- er them with the country, to the American au- horities. If bought at all, it must have been ef- ected with the executive magistrate of the pro- ince. In either event, it must have originated n the grossest corruption, and was rendered null nd void by the treaty between Spain and the Jnited States.

Although Don Joaquin de Anduaga has taken ccassions to heap upon me the most illiberal nd indecorous epithets, he is challenged to ubstantiate a single instance, in which myself, r those acting under me, have not scrupulously xecuted every article of the treaty with Spain.

It appears that the minister of Spain considers is sovereign as having been insulted in the erson of his Commissary, Col. Coppinger, at he time the seizure of the papers was effected; e insists that Col. Coppinger, was entitled to ll the priviliges and immunities of a public of- cer of Spain, in consequence of his being re- ognized as such, in doing and transacting buis- ess with Capt. Bell. The fact was, that Capt. Bell was not vested with any dyplomatic, or ommissarial powers, and any such recognition n his part, was as in-effectual as it was without uthority.

By turning to the act of cession, executed by Col. Butler, and Jose Coppinger, it will be dis- inctly seen, that neither of those persons retain- d any powers as commissioners, after the date f that instrument. If this was the case, it must e equally evident, that neither Capt. Bell, nor Mr. Worthington could have possessed such owers, at the period to which the Spanish minister has alluded. Col. Jose Coppinger being he commander in chief, and Governor *ex officio* ver East Florida, he was charged, under the reaty, with the delivery of the country, and the vithdrawal of the Spanish troops. The moment hese duties were performed, both his and Col. Butler's powers as commissioners ceased. This vent took place on the 10th July, 1821, when he Spanish authorities ceased the exercise of heir functions, as is demonstrated by the fol- owing extract from the act of cession.

There has been verified, at 4 o'clock of the vening of this day, the complete and personal delivery of the fortifications, and all else of this aforesaid province, to the Commissioners, Of- icers, and troops of the United States, and, in consequence thereof, having embarked for the Havana the military and civil officers, and Spanish troops, in the American transports provided for this purpose, *the Spanish authori- ties having this moment ceased the exercise of their functions*, and those appointed by the American Government having begun theirs, &c."

The surrender of the provinces had been completed, and the occasion which created com- missioners ceased to exist. The authority and troops of Spain were withdrawn, and the United States in entire and rightful possession of the country. The six months had also transpired within which the treaty provided the transfer of sovereignty should be made, as well as the evacuation of all the Spanish officers within the Floridas. Col. Coppinger remaining after the occurrence of these events, could no longer be considered as entitled to the privileges and immunities of a public agent. He could only be viewed as a stranger, permitted to reside in the Floridas, " amenable to the common judi- cial tribunals, but who, conformably to the Spanish laws, existing before the cession of the province, would have been liable to removal from it, or to imprisonment, at the discretion of the Governor, for the mere act of being there."

These disclosures, I hope, will exempt me from the criminal charge which Don Joaquin de Anduaga has preferred against me, of having trampled upon the law of nations, and the law of every civilized country. If the detection of treachery, and prevention of fraud, the security of the rights of the citizen, and a scrupulous ad- herence to the articles of the treaty, which both governments were sacredly bound to fulfil, are to be considered atrocities, I have to observe, that I glory in the charge, and give this further assurance, that it is the course which I shall al- ways pursue. I would inquire of this minister, whether the law of nations protects the agents of Spain in the open violation of the treaty, the rights of individuals, and the orders of their government? Does this law sanction the non- compliance with the most solemn engagements by which the rights of individuals were to be sacrificed, by depriving them of those evidences of property stipulated to be delivered over with the country ceded? If so, then is every treaty a perfect mockery, and the law of nations be- comes the authority for every species of fraud and corruption. Coppinger and Callava might not only have carried away all the archives of the country, but also the negroes, or moveable property, and their agency would have secured them from merited punishment.

To the remark of the Spanish minister, " that the more my conduct is considered, the more evident it is, that my sole object has been to in- sult Spain," I have to observe in reply, that it is unjust; I challenge Don Joaquin de Anduaga to establish the fact necessary to authorize such a conclusion If I know myself, I can declare, with the utmost confidence, that I have never entertained any thing like national antiphathies, and that my conduct on no occasion has ever been influenced by such base and unmanly con- siderations. All the measures of my adminis- tration, whilst Governor of the Floridas, were founded upon the principles of justice; the ob- ject of which was to secure to the United States, and the people who were citizens of the ceded provinces, those rights which were guarantied to them under the cession, and which the offi- cers of Spain had wantonly violated, in contra- vention of the treaty, the positive orders of their superiors, and their own solemn pledges and en- gagements. The virtuous and honorable Span- iard claims the same share of my respect and confidence as the citizens belonging to any other nation. I rejoice in the regeneration of Old Spain, and in the independence of the American colonies, and hope that both may free themselves from that misrule and oppression with which they have been cursed, for centuries past, under former governments.

The language used throughout the letters of the minister of Spain, and the charges therein contained in relation to myself, cannot but be viewed as an insult to my government, to the

American people, and to the officer whom he has endeavoured to cover with odium and disgrace. It is derogatory to that comity and decorum which should always characterize diplomatic communications, and which are essential to the harmony and friendly intercourse of nations. In reply, I confidently trust, that the President of the United States will take such a stand, as shall secure the respect due from foreign ministers to his exalted station, to the officers of the government, and to the nation over which he presides.

It is a subject of remark, that I have been the object of Spanish calumny and virulent animadversion, ever since the transactions of the Seminole war. This spirit of hostility is to be discovered in the observation of governor Mahy to Col. Forbes; in the letter of the latter to the Secretary of State, of the 20th May, 1821; in the protests of Cols. Coppinger and Calava; and has prevaded all the diplomatic communications of Spanish ministers, subsequent to the period to which I have alluded. Although such a course is insulting to myself, to the executive and to the American people, I have never deemed it of sufficient importance to induce me to complain.

Feeling a confidence in having always discharged my duty, whilst in the service of my country, I disregarded the abuse and vituperation of Spanish agents, from a belief that my government would vindicate its honor and dignity. This, I flatter myself, will yet be accomplished in due time. A considerable portion of my life has been devoted to the happiness, honor, and glory of my country, and when my conduct has met the approbation of the government, I have a right to expect that it will resist any attempt to slander my reputation. Notwithstanding I solicit the most free and unrestrained investigation into all the measures of my public life, by those to whom I am responsible, it is conceived that the same latitude should not be granted to the ministers of foreign powers.—Such an inteference is rude and indecorous, and should be resented on all proper occasions. This, it is believed, is not due to me alone, but to the President and the nation.

I am, sir, with sentiments of great respect,
Your most obedient and humble servant,
ANDREW JACKSON.

Hon. John Quincy Adams,
Secretary of State.

☞ *The documents referred to are omitted.*

From the Floridian.

LAWS OF FLORIDA.

The following is published for general information as well as to show in what manner the laws of our new Territory are framed.

Ordinance—No. 4.

Whereas, from the extent of the ceded territory, it becomes necessary to make such divisions as will promote the convenience of the inhabitants and a speedy execution of the laws: Therefore, and in virtue of authority vested in me by the Government of the United States, I do ordain:

Sec. 1. That the said Provinces be divided as follows:

All the country lying between the river Perdido and Suwaney river, with all the Islands therein, shall form one county to be called Escambia.

All the country lying east of the river Suwaney and every part of the ceded territories not designated as belonging to the former county, shall form a county to be called St. Johns.

Sec. 2. In each of said counties, and for the Government thereof, there shall be established a court, to be designated a County Court, and to be composed of five Justices of the Peace, any three of whom shall form a quorum, and the eldest, by appointment, to be President of said Court, whose jurisdiction shall extend to all civil cases originating in said county, where the matter in controversy shall exceed twenty-dollars; and to all criminal cases, saving to the parties the right of appeal to the Governor in all cases above the sum of five hundred dollars; and that there shall be no execution for a capital offence until the warrant of the Governor be first had and obtained.

Sec. 3. That the Judicial proceedings in *all* civil cases, shall be conducted except as to the examination of witnesses, according to the course of the existing laws or the laws of Spain; and in criminal cases according to the course of common law; that is, no person shall be held to answer for a capital or other infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, and in all criminal cases the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial Jury of the county wherein the crime shall have been committed, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation, and to be confronted with the witnesses against him, and have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence.

Sec 4. There shall be a clerk appointed for each of said county Courts, who shall receive for his services, such compensation as the Court for which he is appointed may from time to time, and in each suit tax or allow; and there shall also be a sheriff appointed to each court, to execute the process thereof, whose services shall be compensated by the Court, to which he is appointed, in like manner, as is provided for the clerk; and the said Clerk and Sheriff, shall give bond to the presiding Justice, for the faithful discharge of their duties.

Sec 5. Each county Court, shall hold quarterly sessions, and continue the same, until the business pending therein shall be disposed of; the first session to be held at Pensacola, on the first Monday of August next, for the county of Escambia; and at St. Augustine, on the second Monday of September next, for the county of St. Johns, with power to adjourn the same, from time to time.

Sec 6. There shall not be less than ten Justices of the Peace, commissioned for each county, whose jurisdiction shall extend to all civil cases, not exceeding fifty dollars, saving to the parties or suitors, an appeal to the county Court, in all cases wherein the matter in dispute shall exceed the sum of twenty dollars; and shall also be authorised in all criminal cases, to exact surety for good behaviour, and to take recognizance in cases bailable for the appearance of the accused before the county Court.

Sec 7. That the examination of all witnesses, whether the Jurisdiction of the Courts, except

when their personal attendance cannot be procured, shall be conducted *viva voce*; and in open Court, that the parties may conduct their suits in person, or by such counsel as they may choose, provided that the said counsel, or counsellors shall have been duly licensed to practise in the Courts, of the said ceded territories, by the Governor.

Sec 8. The alcades shall continue to exercise the power of Judges of Probates, Registers of Wills, Notaries Puolic, of Justices of the Peace, and such other powers, appertaining to their said offices, as have not been otherwise distributed, saving the right of appeal to the county Court, in all cases.

Sec. 9. That the Judges of the said county courts, shall have power to impose such taxes upon the inhabitants of their counties respectively, as in their discretion, may be necessary to meet and defray the expenses which may be incurred in carrying this ordinance into effect.

Sec. 10. That the said county court shall have and exercise the powers of directing by special *venire* or otherwise, the summoning of all jurors, grand as well as petit.

Sec. 11. That the said courts shall have the power of creating and regulating their process, and proceedings, from time to time, as they may deem necessary, and shall as soon as convenient after their organization, prepare and report a *code bill* to the Governor for his approbation.

Sec. 12. That the said courts shall have and exercise the powers beyond the limits of Pensacola and St. Augustine, of granting and recalling licenses or commissions for *inkeepers, retailers of liquors of every description, and keepers of billiard tables*, and to require of them such surety, as they may deem proper, and impose such price for such licensse, as in their opinion may be reasonable.

Sec. 13. That it shall be the duty of the said courts, in regulating their process and proceedings, to confine the parties strictly to the merits of their cause, and to cause all useless matter, as well as unnecessary form to be expunged from the pleadings at the expense of the party introducing the same, so that justice may be administered in the most simple, cheap, and speedy manner.

Sec. 14. In all criminal cases, the process and indictment shall be in the name of the United States, and there shall be appointed a prosecuting Attorney for each of the said counties, who shall receive in each case, a reasonable compensation, to be taxed by the court.

Sec. 15. That the police of the roads and bridges, without the limits of Pensacola and St. Augustine, shall be under the immediate direction of the said county courts. The police of the city, to be exclusively confided to the Mayor and Aldermen.

ANDREW JACKSON,
Governor of the Floridas, &c. &c. &c.

By the Governor:
R. K. Call,
Acting Secretary of West Florida.
Wm. G. D. Worthington,
Secretary for East Florida.

From the Floridian, of October 8th.

GENERAL JACKSON.

To the Citizens of the Floridas:

The temporary organization of the Government of these provinces, according to the act of Congress of the last session, and to the powers conferred on me, by the President of the United States, I have the satisfaction to announce, is now complete. If it possess imperfections, or defects, the reflecting man will make due allowance, when he considers, that its duration will be but short, and that it is the best, that circumstances would permit, taking into view the difficulties I have had to encounter. Where the rule, or law is certain, I have considered it my duty to follow it strictly, but where this has not been the case, I have endeavoured to make the best provisions, in my power, believing that Government of some kind, was absolutely necessary. It is my sincere hope, that the subject will attract the earliest attention of the Congress of the U. S. and that the inhabitants of these provinces will be relieved from the state of uncertainty and doubt, which at this moment must necessarilly prevail.

In the organization of the present temporary government, and its execution, I have kept steadily in view the securing to the inhabitants of the Floridas all the privileges and immunities guaranteed, to them, by the treaty.

The principal of these is the protection of their persons, property and religion, until they shall be incorporated into the Union, and become entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States.

In performing this important part of my functions, I have endeavored to pursue the spirit of our political institutions. I have made no discrimination of persons, my house has been surrounded by no guards, no one has been kept at a distance by repulsive formalities, all have had free admission, and found a ready ear when they required my aid for the protection of their rights.

The American Government, at the same time that it is the freest, is perhaps the strongest in the world; because the most wealthy and most powerful in society are as weak in opposition to it, as the most humble and obscure. It knows no distinction between an Ex-Governor and a peasant. In the course of my short administration, one case has unfortunately occurred, which required the exertion of that authority, which is no respecter of persons.

That the necessity should have existed, has occasioned me pain and regret; and especially as it has been misunderstood by some of the inhabitants of this country, from a want of a sufficient acquaintance with the facts of the case, as well as with the character and principles of our government. It was my duty, under the treaty exercising the government in the Floridas, to secure to the inhabitants all the evidence of their right of property. The improper conduct of the Captain General of Havanna, in withholding documents, or archieves of this nature from an agent expressly sent to receive them, increased the necessity of vigilance on my part. It was made known to me, by satisfactory evidence, that there were documents of this character, in the hands of an individual here, and that these documents were necessary to establish the right of property in this country.

The fact ascertained, my duty was clear, and no alternative was left me.

That individual was ordered to surrender

them, so that in persuance of the second article of the treaty, and of my proclamation, the inhabitants might be secured in their right of property. The individual thus ordered to deliver them, instead of obeying as he ought, the commands of the Government, under which he was protected, and which could know no superior, excepting the Congress or President of the United States, shifted them into the hands of the person who lately administered the Government of this Province, and who had been authorized by the Captain General to surrender the country agreeably to the stipulations of the treaty. This person, whether from misapprehension, or from worse motives, considered himself not responsible for any act of his to the Government of the Floridas, and appeared entirely insensible to the impropriety *of not having made a delivery of these documents of his own accord.* Whatever diplomatic privileges he might have been entitled to, these privileges had ceased upon the surrender of this country, and he was then not known to me, or recognized as having any other rights than those of a common individual. It was not enough *for him* to consider himself a public agent of the King of Spain, and reside here for the purpose of transacting official business with the agents of the United States, but it was necessary that he should have made known the object and purpose of his stay; had he done so, he would have been informed at once by me, that my own functions having ceased as Commissioner, no one but the President of the United States had any power to give him permission to remain here as a diplomatic *agent, enjoying the privileges of a foreign minister.* The natural consequences of his conduct are too well known, and need not be detailed.

With the exception of this solitary instance, I feel the utmost confidence in saying that nothing has occurred, notwithstanding the numerous cases in which I have been called upon to interpose my authority, either in a judicial or executive capacity, to occasion any thing like distrust, discontent, or want of confidence; and I cheerfully take this occasion to express my satisfaction, with the peaceful, obedient, and orderly conduct of all those, whose allegiance has been transferred to the United States, by the cession of the country. It is true, the recent occurrence, connected with the one referred to, has compelled me to take measures I conceived necessary for the character, dignity, and harmony of the Government I administer, and which at the same time, were the mildest the circumstances would admit. I allude to the conduct of a number of Spanish officers, remaining here after the cession, without my permission, but which would certainly not have been withheld from them, so long as they demeaned themselves respectfully to the existing authorities, and refrained from any improper interference with the measures of the Government. This respect is due from foreign officers in all countries—their situation is materially different from that of other aliens, and their conduct ought therefore to be more circumspect. In the United States, those are severely punished, who are guilty of writing in a libellous manner of proceedings in courts of justice. For what tends to bring the judiciary into disrepute shakes the public confidence in that part of the government that is looked upon as the most sacred depository of individual rights. Hence, in both these points of view, without noticing the singular conduct of the Spanish officers, acting as if they considered themselves a distinct and separate body—an *imperium in imperio*—they were guilty of great indiscretion and impropriety in publishing a most indecent libel against the judiciary proceedings of the highest tribunal in the Floridas. Had I consulted my personal feelings, having entertained a favorable opinion of some of them, and enmity to none, I should have been disposed to have suffered the act to sink into oblivion. But the dignity and honor of the government forbade that conduct so outrageous should pass unnoticed. I might appeal to those very persons and ask what would be the consequences if a band of American officers should offer such an insult to the government of a Spanish Province? But the inhabitants of the Floridas may rest assured that whatever may be the impropriety or imprudence of some, it will have no effect upon my feelings towards the rest—the innocent will not be confounded with the guilty, and all will continue to experience the same protection and respect for their rights which has heretofore been extended, provided they demean themselves with that propriety which becomes every good citizen and subject; and should any of them under the influence of momentary passion or feeling be dissatisfied with the measures I have pursued, on a return of their sober judgment, I feel confident they will be compelled to approve.

Considerations of a personal nature, and the situation of my family requiring my absence from these Provinces for a short period, I make known that in the mean time the Government of East Florida is placed under the charge and direction of Wm. D. G. Worthington, Esq. Secretary for the same, and that of West Florida under Col. George Walton, Secretary thereof. Each of these gentlemen are clothed with all the powers appertaining to the Governors under the late Government of Spain, and subject to such instructions as they may respectively receive from the President of the United States, through me. They are charged faithfully to protect and maintain all the citizens and inhabitants of whatsoever description in the said provinces in the peaceable enjoyment of all their rights, privileges and immunities, secured to them under the late treaty with Spain and under the Constitution of the United States, so far as the same is applicable. I have instructed them promptly to punish the violaters of the law, and require of all, that allegiance to the Government, enjoined by my proclamation, issued on taking possession of the country.

ANDREW JACKSON,
Governor of the Floridas &c. &c.

Pensacola, Oct. 6, 1821.

From the Floridian.

PROCLAMATION.

By Major General ANDREW JACKSON, Governor of the provinces of the Floridas, exercising the powers of the Captain General, and of the Intendant of the Island of Cuba, over the said provinces, and of the Governors of said provinces respectively.

Whereas, by the seventh article of the treaty concluded between the United States and Spain,

n the 22d day of February, 1819, and duly tified, it was stipulated that the "*officers* and roops of his Catholic Majesty in the territories ereby ceded to the United States shall be ithdrawn, and possession of the places occuied by them shall be given within six months fter the ratification of the treaty, or sooner if ossible." And whereas, it has this day been nade known to me, that the following officers f his Catholic Majesty, to-wit, Marcos de Vilers, Barnardo Prieto, Louis Gayarre, Civilo esassier, Arnaldo Guillamard, Carlos de Villiers, redo de Vegas, and Mariana Latady, and who ccording to the seventh article, ought to have withdrawn from the said ceded territory, with he troops of his Catholic Majesty, have without the permission of the existing authorities, contrary to the said seventh article, remained in this city and its vicinity: And whereas it has been made known to me, that the said officers, acting in a distinct body, independent of, and disowning even a temporary allegeance to the government of the United States, as existing in the Floridas, have been engaged in stirring up disaffection thereto, and in sowing discontent in the minds of the good people of this said province, and whereas it appears, that they are the authors of the following, false scandelous and indecent publication*.

"In speaking of Colonel Calava's appearance before General Jackson, H. B. ought to have stated, that none of the interrogatories, and highly offensive accusations of the General, were faithfully interpreted to Col Calava, any more than the replies of the latter to the former.

It was therefore out of the power of our chief, not knowing what was said to him, to make the auditory understand, how innocent he was of the foul charges, with which his unsullied honor was endeavoured to be stained, such in sum are the observations we had to make, on the observations of H. B. and we hope that he and the public will be convinced, that we acted from no principle of pusillanimity, that if on the one hand *we shuddered at the violent proceedings exercised against our superior*, we knew also, what was due to a Government, which is on the most friendly footing with our own.

We are &c. &c.

THE SPANISH OFFICERS,

Resident in this place."

And whereas the said publication is calculated to excite resistance in the existing Government of the Floridas, and to disturb the harmony, peace, and good order of the same as well as to weaken the allegiance enjoined by my proclamation, heretofore published, and entirely incompatible with any privileges which could have been extended to the said officers, even if permission had been expressly given them to remain in the said province, and, under existing circumstances, a gross abuse of the lenity and indulgence heretofore extended to them.

This, is therefore, to make known to the said officers to withdraw themselves, as they ought, heretofore, have done, from the Floridas, agreeably to the said seventh article, on or, before the third day of October next, after which day, if they, or any of them, shall be found within the Floridas, all officers, civil and military, are hereby required to arrest, and secure them, so that they may be brought before me to be dealt with according to law, for the contempt and disobedience of this, my proclamation.

Given at Pensacola, this 29th day of September, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-one, and of the Independence of the United States the forty-sixth.

ANDREW JACKSON,
Governor of the Floridas, &c.

---

* This is a part of their answer to a piece, published by H Biglow Esq. in which they seize the opportunity to attack Gov. Jackson. The report that he is about to resign his office is unfounded, tho' it appears he intended to take his family to Tennessee, from which he would return as soon as possible.—*Ed. Reg.*

The Secretary of State to Don Joaquin d'Anduaga.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, 5th April, 1822.

SIR: In the letters which I had the honor of writing you, on the 2d of November, and 31st of December last, you were informed that a definitive answer to the complaints against certain proceedings of General Andrew Jackson, while governor of Florida, which were contained in a letter to this Department from Don Hilario de Rivas y Salmon, before your arrival in this country, and in your letters of the 13th and 22d of November, would be given after the substance of those complaints should have been made known to General Jackson, and his explanations of the motives and considerations by which he had been governed in adopting the measures complained of, should have been received.

In performing this promise I am commanded by the President of the United States to repeat the assurance of his deep regret, that the transactions, which formed the subject of these complaints, should ever have occurred, and his full conviction, upon a review of all the circumstances which have attended them, that they are attributable entirely to the conduct of the Governor and Captain General of Cuba, and of the subordinate officers of Spain, in evading and refusing the fulfilment of the most express and positive stipulations of the treaty, both of evacuating the province within six months from the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty, and of delivering the archives and documents relating directly to the property and sovereignty of the provinces.

At the time of the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty, your predecessor, General Vives, delivered an order from His Catholic Majesty to the Captain General and Governor of the Island of Cuba, *and of the Floridas*, informing him of the cession to the United States of that part of the provinces of which he was the governor, that was situated on this continent, and instructing him as follows:

"I command you, and ordain, that, after the "information which shall be seasonably given "you by my Minister Plenipotentiary and En- "voy Extraordinary at Washington, of the rati- "fications having been exchanged, you proceed "on your part, to make the proper dispositions, "in order that, at the end of six months, count- "ing from the date of the exchange of the rati- "fications *or sooner if possible*, the Spanish offi-

"cers and troops may evacuate the territories "of both Floridas, and that possession of them "be given to the officers or commissioners of "the United States, *duly authorized to receive "them.* You shall arrange, in proper time, the "delivery of the Islands adjacent and dependent "upon the two Floridas, and the public lots "and squares, vacant lands, public edifices, "fortifications, barracks, and other buildings, "which are not private property; as also the ar-"chives and documents which relate directly "to the property and sovereignty of the same "two provinces, by placing them at the dispo-"sal of the commissaries or officers of the Uni-"ted States, *duly authorized to receive them.*"

This order, thus clear and explicit, was despatched, together with letters from General Vives, to the governor of Cuba and the Floridas notifying him of the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty, by Col. James G. Forbes, who was commissioned, "as agent and commissary of the United States, to deliver to him the Royal order," to arrange and concert with him, conformably to instructions committed therewith, the execution of the above stipulations, and to receive from the said governor and from any and every person possessed of the said archives and documents, all and every one of the same, and to dispose thereof in the manner prescribed by his instructions." Colonel Forbes' authority, thus, was to *receive* the documents and archives, and to *concert and arrange* with the governor of the Floridas, the *delivery* of those provinces, which General Jackson was commissioned to receive, take possession of, and occupy, and of which he was further commissioned to be the governor, when surrendered to the United States.

The royal order was delivered by Colonel Forbes to the Governor of the Floridas, at the Havanna, on the 23d of April, 1821. There has been shown by that Governor no cause or reason which could justly have required him to delay the delivery of the documents and archives, and the arrangements for the delivery of the provinces, beyond the term of a single week. There were *twenty* boxes of those archives and documents; the whole, or with very few exceptions, the whole, of which ought, by the positive stipulation of the treaty, and by the express order of the King of Spain, to have been immediately delivered to Colonel Forbes. Not one of them was delivered to him; nor has one of them been delivered to this day.

The orders for the surrender of the provinces were delayed from day to day, notwithstanding the urgent and continual solicitations of Colonel Forbes, for the term of six weeks, at the end of which, to avoid further indefinite procrastination, he was compelled to depart without receiving the archives and documents, but, with repeated promises of the Governor, that they should be transmitted to this government—promises which have remained to this day unperformed.

The orders for the delivery of the provinces themselves, were not only thus unreasonably withheld, but when made out, though not furnished to Colonel Forbes till the last week in May, were made to bear date on the fifth of that month: nor were they prepared conformably to the stipulation of the treaty, or to the royal order of his Catholic Majesty: for, instead of directing the surrender to be made to the commissioners or officers of the United States, *duly authorized to receive them*, the instruction to the commanders in East and West Florida was to deliver those respective provinces to Colonel Forbes himself, who had from the United States no authority to receive them. And although expressly advised of this fact by Col. Forbes, with the request that the orders of delivery might be amended, and made conformable to the treaty, and to the royal command, Governor Mahy did not so amend it, but reduced Colonel Forbes to the alternative of submitting to further delays, or of departing with an imperfect and ambiguous order of delivery of West Florida, authorizing its surrender to the legally constituted authorities of the United States, (that is, as Governor Mahy well knew, to General Andrew Jackson) only, in case of any accident happening to Col. Forbes, whom he still affected to consider, notwithstanding his own express declaration to the contrary, as the commissioned agent of the United States to that effect.

The twenty boxes of documents and archives, which were at the Havana, as has been mentioned, had been transmitted thither from Pensacola; and contained all the most important records of property in West Florida. The possession of them was in the highest degree important to the United States, not only as the vouchers of individual property, but as protecting guards against the imposture of fraudulent grants.

The same persevering system of withholding documents which it was their duty to deliver, has marked, I am deeply concerned to say, the conduct of both the commanders of East and West Florida, who were charged, respectively, to deliver those provinces to the United States. It is to this cause, and to this alone, as appears from a review of all the transactions of which you have complained, that must be traced the origin of all those severe measures which General Jackson himself was the first, while deeming them indispensable to the discharge of his own official duties, to lament. Charged as he was with the trust of receiving the provinces in behalf of the United States, of maintaining their rights of property within them, of guarding them to the utmost of his power from those frauds to which there was too much reason to apprehend they would be liable, and to which the retention of the documents gave so great and dangerous scope; entrusted, from the necessity of the case, during the interval of time, while the general laws of the United States remained unextended to the provinces, with the various powers which had, until that time, been exercised by the Spanish Governors, and which included the administration of justice between individuals; it was impossible that he should not feel the necessity of exercising, under circumstances thus exasperating and untoward, every authority committed to him by the supreme authority of his country, to preserve inviolate, so far as on him depended, the interests of that country, and the sacred obligations of individual right.

In the proceedings connected with the delivery of the province, he had as little reason to be satisfied with the conduct of Col. Callava, as with that of the Captain General. On a plea of

disposition, that officer had, on the day of the surrender, evaded the performance of a solemn promise, which General Jackson had considered an indispensable preliminary to the act; and afterwards the Colonel positively declined its fulfilment. He had, however, completed the surrender of the province with which he had been charged. He had declined producing to General Jackson any credential as a commissioner for performing that act; but had informed him that he should make the surrender as the commanding officer of the province, by virtue of orders from his superior. This service had been consummated; and Colonel Callava, whom Gen. Jackson had formerly notified that he had closed with him his official correspondence forever, was bound, by the special stipulations of the treaty, to have evacuated, as one of the Spanish officers, the province, before the 22d of August. If General Jackson had, in courtesy to Col. Callava, considered him, notwithstanding his own disclaimer of the character, as a *Commissioner*, for the delivery of the province, there can be no pretence that he was entitled to special privileges under it, after he had avowedly performed all its duties; after he had been informed by General Jackson that their official correspondence was finally closed; and after the date when, by the positive engagements of the treaty which he was to execute, he was bound to have departed from the province. From the time when his functions for the surrender of the province were discharged, he could remain in Pensacola no otherwise than as a private unprivileged individual, amenable to the duly constituted American authorities of the place, and subject to the same controul of General Jackson, as a private citizen of the United States would have been to that of the Governor of the Floridas, before the surrender had taken place.

That this was the opinion of Col. Callava himself, and of his friends who applied to Judge Fromentin for the writ of *habeas corpus*, to rescue him from the arrest under which he was placed by the order of Gen. Jackson, is apparent from their conduct on that occasion. It is stated by Judge Fromentine, that, before granting the supposed writ of *habeas corpus*, he required that Col Callava should enter into a recognizance for twenty thousand dollars, with two securities, each for the amount of ten thousand dollars; the condition of which recognizance was, that Col. Callava should personally be and appear before the Judge of the United States for West Florida, &c. whenever required so to do; that he should not depart from the city of Pensacola, without the leave of the said court, nor send away, remove, or otherwise dispose of, unknown to the said court, any of the papers in question. It was only upon the promise of his friends that this recognizance should be executed, that Judge Fromentin consented to issue the writ of *habeas corpus*, and this recognizance renounces in fact every pretension of exemption from the judicial authority of the country; and consequently of the diplomatic privileges of a commissioner.

It has been seen that the most important documents relating to the property of West Florida had been transmitted to the Havana; there remained, however, a portion of them, particularly of judicial records, relating to the titles of individual property. Some of these Colonel Callava did deliver up with the province; others, of the same description and character, indispensable for the administration of justice in the province, and useless at the Havana, whither it was his intention to have transported them, were retained; not in his possession, but in that of Don Domingo Sousa, a Spanish officer, who, by the stipulation of the treaty, ought also to have departed from the province before the 22d of August.

The day immediately preceding that date, the alcalde of Pensacola, at the suit of a woman, in a humble walk, indeed, of life, but whose rights were, in the eye of General Jackson, equally entitled to his protection with those of the highest rank, or the most commanding opulence, had represented to him that a number of documents, belonging to the alcalde's office, and relating to estates at that place, and to suits there instituted, were in the possession of Domingo Sousa; that the necessity for obtaining possession of those documents was urgent, and therefore he requested the Governor to authorize some one to make a regular demand of them, and to ascertain what they were. Governor Jackson, accordingly, forthwith commissioned the secretary of the territory, the alcalde of Pensacola himself, and the clerk of the county court of Escambia, to proceed to the dwelling of Sousa, to make demand of all such papers or documents, belonging to the alcalde's office, as might be in his possession; and in case of Sousa's refusal to exhibit or deliver the same, immediately to report the fact to him, the Governor in writing. These commissioners the next day reported to the Governor that they had examined the papers in the possession of Sousa; that they had found among them four sets of papers of the kind which belonged to the office of the alcalde, and among them those in which the woman from whom the first application had proceeded was interested; that they had, both verbally and in writing, demanded of him the delivery of those documents, which no private individual had a right to keep, as they related to the rights of persons holding or claiming property in the province, but that Sousa had refused to deliver them, alleging that he was but the servant of Colonel Callava, and could not deliver them without his order. In the transactions of Sousa, on this occasion, is manifested the same consciousness that the claim of diplomatic privilege, set up by Col. Callava, to screen him from the operation of the authority of Governor Jackson, was without foundation. For, although he refused to deliver up the papers, conformably to the Governor's command, he submitted to the examination of them by the commissioners, in obedience to the same authority; and, though he declined receiving from them the letter demanding the delivery of the papers, he told them that, to relieve himself from the responsibility of keeping them, he should deliver them to Governor Callava himself. They were accordingly sent to the house of Col. Callava, and put into the possession of his steward Fullerat. It is clear, however, that, if the papers, while in Sousa's possession, were privileged from delivering up at the command of Governor Jackson, they were equally privileged from examination by the same authority; and, if they were not lawfully screened from his

process in the custody of Sousa, they could not be made so by removing them to the house of Col. Callava. The truth is, that the removal of the documents, at that time, and in such a manner, was a high and aggravated contempt of the lawful authority of the Governor. It not only claimed for Col. Callava diplomatic immunities, but assumed that he was still the Governor of the province, and that Sousa was amenable for his conduct only to him. Col. Callava might, on the same pretence, have retained the whole body of the Spanish officers and troops under his command at Pensacola, and insisted on exercising over them all his extinguished authority, as Governor and commander-in-chief, after the 21st of August, as he could to exercise any official authority within the province, over Domingo Sousa, or to extricate him from the lawful jurisdiction of Gov. Jackson.

It is under these circumstances that the subsequent measures of Governor Jackson are to be considered. He immediately issued an authority to Colonel Robert Butler, and Colonel John Miller, to seize the body of Sousa, together with the papers, and to bring them before him, that Sousa might answer such interrogatories as might be put to him, *and comply* with such order and decree, touching the said documents and records, *as the rights of the individuals, secured to them by the treaty, might require, and the justice of the case might demand.* By virtue of this order, Sousa was brought before Governor Jackson, and again recognized the authority under which he was taken, by answering the interrogatories put to him. But he had already put the papers and documents out of his possession; and thus, as far as was in his power, baffled the ends of justice, and set at defiance the lawful authority of the Governor.

In this transaction, Col. Callava was avowedly the principal agent; and altogether unjustifiable as it was, whatever consequences of inconvenience to himself resulted from it, must be imputed to him. It was an undisguised effort to prostrate the authority of the United States in the province; nor had Governor Jackson any other alternative to choose, than tamely to see the sovereign power of his country, entrusted to him, trampled under foot, and exposed to derision by a foreigner, remaining there only upon his sufferance, or by the vigorous exercise of his authority to vindicate at once the rights of the United States, and the just claims of individuals to their protection.

Governor Jackson could consider Col. Callava in no other light than that of a private individual, entitled indeed, as the officer of a foreign power, to courtesy, but not to exemption from the process of the law. Nothwithstanding his improper conduct, Governor Jackson, in the first instance, authorized Col. Butler and Dr. Bronaugh, accompanied by Mr. Brackenridge, the Alcalde, to wait upon him and his steward, and demand from them the specified papers, which Sousa had declared, in his answer to the interrogatories to have been delivered to the steward at Governor Callava's house. It was only in case of the refusal to give up the papers, that the order extended to the seizure of the person of Col. Callava, that he might be made to appear before Governor Jackson, to answer interrogatories, and to abide by, and perform, such order and decree as the justice of the case might demand. This demand was accordingly made, and although at the first moment premptorily refused, yet, upon Col. Callava's being informed that his refusal would be considered as setting at defiance the authority of the governor of the Floridas, and of the consequences to himself which must ensue upon his persisting therein, he desired to be furnished with a memorandum, setting forth the documents required, which was accordingly done. But when the delivery of the papers was again demanded of him, he repeated the refusal to deliver them, and attempted both to avoid the personal approach of Colonel Butler and Dr. Bronaugh, and to exhibit a resistance by force of arms to the execution of the Governor's order. And it is not a little remarkable, that among the persons who appeared thus arrayed against the authority of the United States, to accomplish the denial and removal of the papers, was a man against whom the most important of those papers were judicial decisions of Governor Callava himself, in behalf of the orphan children, for the establishment of whose rights they were indispensably necessary, and at whose application they had been required.

Standing thus, in open defiance to the operation of the law, Colonel Callava was taken before the Governor; and there refusing to answer the interrogatories put to him, and asserting the groundless pretension of answering only as a commissioner, and by a protest against the acts of the Governor, he was, by his order, committed to prison, until the documents should be delivered to the Alcalde. On the next day, a search warrant for the papers was issued by the Governor, upon which they were actually obtained, and directed to be delivered to the Alcalde; whereupon, Colonel Callava was immediately released.

In all these proceedings, you will perceive, sir, that not one act of rigor, or even of discourtesy towards Colonel Callava, was authorized by Governor Jackson, which was not indispensably necessitated for the maintenance of his authority, and the discharge of his official duty, by the unjustifiable and obstinate resistance of Colonel Callava himself.

On a review of the whole transactions, I am instructed by the President of the United States to say, that he considers the documents in question, as among those which, by the stipulation of the treaty, ought to have been delivered up, with the province, to the authorities of the United States; that they were, on the 22d of August, when in the possession of Domingo Sousa, within the jurisdiction of the United States, and subject to the control of their Governor, acting in his judicial capacity, and liable to be compulsively produced by his order, that the removal of them from the possession of Sousa, after the Governor's order to him to deliver them had been served upon him, could not withdraw them from the jurisdiction of Governor Jackson, and was a high and aggravated outrage upon his lawful authority; that the imprisonment of Colonel Callava was a necessary, though by the President deeply regretted consequence, of his obstinate perseverance in refusing to deliver the papers, and of his unfounded claim of diplomatic immunities, and irregular exercise even of the authorities of a governor of Florida, after the authority of Spain in the province had been

publicly and solemnly surrendered to the United States.

That the documents were of the description of those which the treaty had stipulated should be delivered up with the province, is obvious, from the consideration of their character. They related to the property of lands in the province. They were judicial records, directly affecting the rights of persons remaining in the province; rights which could not be secured without them; rights over which the appellate tribunal of the governor of Cuba, to which Colonel Callava proposed to remove the papers, thenceforth could have no authority or control, they having become definitively subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. The only reason assigned by Colonel Callava for the pretension to retain them, is, that they related to the estate of a deceased Spanish officer, and had thereby been of the resort of the military tribunal. But it was for the rights of the living, and not for the privileges of the dead, that the documents were to operate. The tribunal of the captain general of Cuba could neither need the production of the papers, nor exercise any authority over the subject-matter to which they related. To have transferred to the island of Cuba a question of litigated property, concerning land in Florida, between persons, all of whom were living, and to remain in Florida, would have been worse than a mockery of justice. Indeed Mr. Salmon, in his note, appears to have been aware of the weakness of this allegation, declines the discussion of the question; and in justification of the refusal of Col. Callava to deliver up the documents, merely rests its defence upon the plea, that the papers had not been demanded of him *officially*. It has been seen, that Col. Callava had no official character which could then exempt him from the compulsive process of the governor. But Mr. Salmon alleges that the Spanish constitution, as well as that of the United States, separates the judicial from the executive power exercised by the governor or captain general of a province.

Neither the constitution, nor the laws of the United States, excepting those relating to the revenue and its collection, and to the slave-trade, had at that time been extended to Florida.—And as little had the Spanish constitution been introduced there, in point of fact, however it might have been proclaimed. But be this as it may, the cause, in relation to which the documents required in the case of Vidal had been drawn up, and were needed, was one of those which, under the Spanish constitution itself, remained within the jurisdiction of the governor. This is declared by Colonel Callava himself, in the third observation of the appendix to his protest, transmitted with the letter of Mr. Salmon. It is the reason assigned by him for having withheld those documents from the Alcalde. And one of them was a judgment rendered by Col. Callava himself, after the time when the proclamation of the Spanish constitution in the province is alleged to have been made. The cause therefore, was on every hypothesis, within the jurisdiction of the governor; the papers were indispensable for the administration of justice in the cause; and when once applied for, by a person entitled to the benefit of them, it was the duty, the inexorable duty, of governor Jackson, to put forth all the authority vested in him, necessary to obtain them.

Nor less imperative was his obligation to punish, without respect of persons, that contempt of his jurisdiction, which was manifested in the double attempt of Colonel Callava to defy his power, and to evade the operation of its process.

With regard to the proclamation of General Jackson, of the 29th of September, commanding several Spanish officers, who, in violation of the stipulation of the treaty, had remained at Pensacola, after the expiration of the six months from the day of the ratification of the treaty, to withdraw, within four days, from the Floridas, which forms the subject of complaint in your letter of the 18th of November, it might be sufficient to say, that it did no more than enjoin upon those officers to do that which they ought before, and without any injunction, to have done. The engagement of the treaty was, that they should all have evacuated the province before the 22d of August.

If they remained there after that time, it could only be as private individuals, amenable in every particular to the laws. Even this was merely an indulgence, which it was within the competency of General Jackson, at any time, to have withdrawn From the extract of a letter from him, of which I have the honor of enclosing a copy, it will be seen, that he was far from being disposed to withdraw it, had they not, by their abuse of it, and by open outrages upon his authority, forfeited all claims to its continuance.

This extract furnishes a satisfactory answer to your question, why, if the fulfilment of the article was the object of the proclamation, it was confined to the eight officers, by name, and not extended to all other Spanish officers in the Floridas. It was because the deportment of the others was as became them, decent, respectful, and friendly towards the government, under the protection of which they were permitted to abide. In the newspaper publication, which gave rise to the proclamation of General Jackson, the Spanish officers avowedly acted, not as private individuals, but as a distinct body of men, speaking of Col. Callava as *their chief, their superior;* and arrogating to themselves, as a sort of merit, the condescension of knowing what was due to a government (meaning the American government) which was on the most friendly footing with their own. This is language which would scarcely be proper for the embassador of one nation, upon the territory of another, to which he would owe not even a temporary allegiance. From persons situated as those Spanish officers were, it was language of insubordination and contempt.

In alluding to the fact, that officers of the American squadron, in the Mediterranean, are sometimes received with friendly treatment on the territories of Spain, to make a case paralell with the present, it would be necessary to show, that some superior officer of the said squadron should, while enjoying the hospitality of the Spanish nation upon their shores, first attempt to evade and to resist, the operation of process from the constituted judicial tribunals of the country, and then pretend, as an American officer, to be wholly independent of them: and

that some of his subalterns should not only countenance and support him in these attempts but should affect to consider him, while on Spanish ground, as their only superior and chief, and by unfounded and inflammatory publications in the daily journals to arouse the people of Spain to revolt and insurrection against the judicial tribunal of their own country.

If the bare statement of such a case would be sufficient to raise the indignation of every honorable Spaniard, let it be observed, that even this would be without some of the aggravations of the conduct of these Spanish officers at Pensacola. For such outrage would be far less dangerous, committed against old established authorities, which might rely upon the support of the whole people surrounding them, than in the presence of a people, whose allegiance had been just transferred to a new government, and when the revolt to which they were stimulated, would seem little more than obedience to the authorities to which they had always been accustomed to submit.

The very power which the Spanish governor and officer had exercised before the surrender of the province, ought to have been a most urgent warning to them to avoid every semblance of authority in themselves, or of resistance to that of the United States, after the transfer of the province had been completed.

In forbearing particularly to reply to that part of your note, in which you think yourself authorized to pronounce the charge of General Jackson against these Spanish officers, of having attempted to excite discontent in the inhabitants, *false*, I shall barely express the hope, that the term was admitted into your communication inadvertantly. The conduct of the officers, at the time of Colonel Callava's conflict with the authority of the governor, as well as in their insulting newspaper publication, was of a character and tendency too strongly marked, to leave a doubt of the truth with which it is described in General Jackson's proclamation, and in passing unnoticed this and other mere invectives against an officer, whose services to this nation have entitled him to their highest regard, and whose whole career has been signalized by the purest intentions and the most elevated purposes, I wish to be understood as abstaining from observations, which, however justified by the occassion, could but add to the unpleasantness of a discussion already sufficiently painful.

That this conduct on the part of the Spanish officers was highly reprehensible, cannot reasonably be denied, and had General Jackson been disposed to animadvert upon it with severity, his course would undoubtedly have been that which you have pointed out as appropriate to the offence. They would have been cited before the proper tribunal, heard upon specific charges, allowed time and liberty to make their defence, and punished by commitment to prison. General Jackson preferred a milder a more indulgent measure; and without prosecuting them as criminals, only withdrew from them the privilege of a protracted infraction of the treaty, by requiring them forthwith to depart from the province. To justify him in this requisition, neither arrest nor judicial trial was necessary or proper. The facts were of public notoriety, and could not be denied. The proclamation only required of them the execution of the treaty, by the removal of their persons Had their conduct even been unexceptionable, this measure would have been within the undoubted authority of General Jackson. As their deportment had been, it was the most lenient exercise of his power practicable, to vindicate the insulted honor and justice of his country.

I pass to the consideration of the complaints contained in your letter of the 22d of November. In order to take a correct view of this subject, it is again necessary to advert to the royal order of his Catholic Majesty to the Captain General and Governor of the Island of Cuba, and of the Floridas, commanding him to cause to be placed at the disposal of the commissaries or officers of the United States, duly authorised to receive them, the archives and documents relating directly to the property and sovereignty of the two provinces.

On the 16th of May, the Captain General and Governor wrote to Colonel Forbes, that, "respecting East Florida, where there ought to be found all her archives, he, Governor Mahy, would direct Governor Coppinger to make a formal delivery of that province, *as well as of the documents belonging to it.*"

On the 24th of May, Colonel Forbes wrote to the Captain General, reminding him of the repeated promises made by his excellency, to despatch him with the archives, which were to be delivered, and then were at the Havana, and with the orders for the delivery of the provinces and of the archives deliverable there; of the continual disappointments to which he had been subjected by the failure of performance to those promises, and of the necessities which urged his immediate departure. He therefore proposed," that if any further researches should be necessary for the discovery of the said archives, they might be delivered when more convenient to the Spanish government; that he, (Colonel Forbes) should be allowed to proceed immediately to West Florida, with the commissary appointed to carry the final order to the sub-governor there; and, lastly, that a duplicate order to be given at once, *as agreed upon*, to the Governor of East Florida, for the delivery of that province to the constituted authorities of the United States, *together with the archives which were declared to be on the spot.*

On the 29th of May, the Captain General answered this letter, and enclosed to him the orders to the several Governors of East and West Florida, for the delivery of the provinces, antedated as I have already mentioned, with a declaration, that the archives then at the Havana, and which ought to have been delivered to Colonel Forbes, *should be transmitted to the Government of the United States*, as soon as they were selected; a promise, at I have before observed, yet unfulfilled.

These orders of the Captain General to the commanders of East and West Florida, are further remarkable by the omission of any direction in them for the delivery of the archives and documents. It had been expressly agreed by him, with colonel Forbes, that the order for the delivery of East Florida should include that of the archives. But it was not sufficient for Governor Mahy to avoid the performance of this promise.

By the letter from Colonel Butler to General

Jackson, of the 21st January last, a copy of which I have the honor to enclose, it appears that, with regard to the greatest and most important part of those documents, he had expressly instructed colonel Coppinger *not* to deliver them. And hence, when on the 18th of June colonel Butler, the officer of the United States authorized to receive the province, notified colonel Coppinger that he had designated Major Cross to receive the archives relating to the sovereignty and individual property of the province, he was answered by colonel Coppinger, "as respects the delivery of the public archives, containing the records of individual property of this province, *that will be delayed*, until various doubts that occur are cleared up; but they will not be removed until then, nor will I leave this place until all matters are regulated and concluded between us, that demand my personal assistance."

Thus, upon the pretence of doubts, the nature of which was not explained, Colonel Coppinger declined, positively, to deliver up documents conformably to the express stipulation of the treaty. Col. Butler immediately proposed to him a conference on the subject, which was held on the 21st of June. At that conference, Colonel Coppinger told Colonel Butler, that "as an individual, he believed these archives should be given over to the United States, but, that *his orders prevented him from turning them over.*" Colonel Butler therefore assented, as, indeed, no other alternative seemed to be left him, that Colonel Coppinger should have time to write to the Captain General of Cuba, for the decision of his doubts; and mentioned to him the opportunity of a vessel then about to sail for the Havana, when she was to return to St Augustine, and might bring the answer of the Captain General. Colonel Coppinger, on the 23d of June, informed Colonel Butler, that he had that day written to the Captain General for the solution of his doubts; and until he received his answer, the archives should not be removed from St. Augustine, and should remain precisely as they were. Colonel Butler by his letter of 26th June, agreed to remain silent on the head of the archives, until the answer should be received from the Captain General; but within one week from that time, Colonel Butler received information, that a large portion of these documents were packed for transportation. He wrote, therefore, on the 3d of July, to Colonel Coppinger, enumerating specifically several kinds of records, relating directly to the property of the province, and declaring that he considered them among those which were not to be removed; the reply to which, by Colonel Coppinger, is especially to be remarked, as expressing his opinion, that several of those documents were *excluded from delivery*. There can be no reasonable doubt, that all the papers specified by Colonel Butler's letter, were of those which the treaty had stipulated should be delivered up. When, therefore, General Jackson considered, and compared together, the express and positive order of the King of Spain, to the Captain General, and Governor of Cuba, that he should faithfully see to the delivery of the documents; the pretences on which he evaded the delivery, to Colonel Forbes, of those which were at the Havana, within his own control; the *promise* that he would direct the delivery, by Colonel Coppinger, of those that were at St. Augustine; the peremptory postponement of Colonel Coppinger, to deliver up any documents or records relating to individual property; his engagement that none of them should be removed, until he should receive further instructions from the Captain General, and within one week after, his attempt to pack up for transportation to Cuba, a large portion of them; and finally, his pretensions that many papers, manifestly having direct relation to the property of the province, were excluded from delivery, and his recurrence to the *literal* sense of his orders from the Captain General, with the verbal avowal to Colonel Butler, of his own opinion that the documents ought to be delivered, though he was forbidden by his instructions to deliver them: it was impossible for General Jackson to close his eyes against proceedings so unjustifiable and improper. He therefore gave instructions to the officer commanding at St. Augustine, to take possession of the papers which the treaty had stipulated should be delivered.

The necessity for taking possession of them had indeed arisen before the instructions of General Jackson were received. Most of the records relating to individual property had been left in possession of Don Juan de Entralgo, who on the pretence that he had purchased at public sales, under the Spanish Government, not only those documents, but the office of register of them, openly advanced the claim of retaining the records as his private property, and of continuing the exercise of the office, and receiving fees for granting copies of the same.

These pretensions were raised on the 5th of September, nearly three months after the doubts of Colonel Coppinger had, with the consent of Colonel Butler, been referred to the Captain General and Governor of Cuba. Long before that time, the answer of that officer ought to have been received, peremptorily commanding the delivery of the papers.

It was impossible that the United States should acquiesce in the claims of Mr. Entralgo. They were unquestionably entitled to the documents: and whatever injury he might sustain by the delivery of them, it might give him a fair demand of indemnity from his own government, but certainly not from the United States.

Yet the Secretary and acting Governor, Mr Worthington, allowed a further delay of nearly a month, before taking the decisive measures necessary to obtain the documents. He then, on the 3d of October, authorized three persons of respectable character to obtain them, with the use of force if necessary: but with all suitable delicacy and respect towards the persons who had been the officers of Spain in the province. I have the honor of enclosing, herewith, copies of the orders from the Secretary Worthington, to the commissioners appointed by him to receive, and afterwards to examine and assort the papers, and of their reports to him, exhibiting the manner in which both those services were performed. They will prove, that every regard was shewn towards Colonel Coppinger, and Mr. Entralgo, compatible with the execution of the duty; and after the assortment of the papers, all those which were not of the description stipulated to be delivered over by the treaty, have ever been, and yet are, ready to be returned to Colonel Coppinger, or to any person duly authorized to receive them.

(Remainder in our next.)

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, AUGUST 2, 1828. No. 21

accuracies, and continue to write very frequently to your friend,

J. J. CRITTENDEN.

Hon. D. White, Washington.

(No. 11.)

Extract of a letter from F. P. Blair to David White, dated,

Frankfort, January 19th, 1825.

My Dear Sir: I have not hitherto troubled you with communications, being sensible that your numerous correspondents would detail to you more satisfactorily than I could, our local news and state politics. But since our General Assembly has thought fit to forward a *request* on the subject of the presidential question, calculated to limit your views, and counteract, possibly, intentions best adapted to promote the very interests which it was designed to serve, I have supposed that the opinions of any of your immediate constituents on this interesting topic, might not be unacceptable to you.

Upon the naked question on which our Legislature voted—"which of the candidates now before the House of Representatives do the people of Kentucky prefer as President," I have no doubt they decided in conformity to the public will. But this subject must come before you, with many additional accompaniments which grow out of circumstances of which our Legislature could have no information, and which may and ought to be greatly influential with you. Your nearer position, may enable you to see beyond the elevated point which alone has attracted our attention, and (as the saying is) to know how the land lies about it. In a word, you have it in your power to vote not only with a view to the first officer, but probably in reference to the whole administration. Under some circumstances, the later consideration might deservedly be more influential than the first, as the selection of the managers of the departments not only involves in a great degree the conduct of public affairs throughout the presidential term, but may, & probably will decide the next presidential contest. Views of this kind could not enter into the question brought by the resolutions before our Legislature. They could not, indeed, with propriety, have formed, however interesting, fit topics of discussion, much less of decision; and if they had been appropriate, there was no information, not even a conjecture, as to the intentions of the rivals, with regard to their projected cabinets. Many influenced by these circumstances, were disposed to let the subject remain in the hands of our delegation, unbiassed by any vote of the General Assembly I sincerely believe that this was the wish of the majority, but the resolutions, having been for some time repressed by such considerations, were at last introduced and urged upon the House by an individual who was always opposed to Clay and zealous for Jackson.

They would have been then, I think, indefinitely postponed upon the single consideration, that Mr. Clay's future prospects might be somewhat jeopardised by them, if the importunity of Jackson's friends had not practiced on the zeal of both parties, engaged in the war of state politics.

Mr. Clay's sentiments on the Judge question, the all absorbing subject for the present, were held out to the majority as hostile to their own. This produced considerable alienation among them, and the feeling thus engendered was greatly increased by the late denunciations in the "Reporter," which, it was insinuated, spoke from feelings derived from a higher source than the editor. This temper in the House, so overheated as to be wrought into a weapon of any shape, if to be employed upon the opposition, was worked upon successfully by the friends of Gen. Jackson. Rowan, Daveiss, M'Afee, and *divers leaders* out of the House, gave the direction to the current of party feeling. The other side, conscious that their opponents would be glad to employ a triumphant name against them, (for all went on the supposition that Jackson would be elected with or without our vote,) determined to elude the chase by joining in the cry. Thus, the resolutions were interwoven in our party questions at home, to have effect during the next election, in which judge breaking, it is thought by the anties, will make a still more formidable figure before the public, than heretofore. Of this doubtless you are apprised; for you have, I expect, been amply supplied with preambles, responses, protests, &c which give "dreadful note of preparation." But notwithstanding the adverse circumstance that Mr. Clay was indentified with the minority, which, with the judge-breakers, (of whom I can speak freely, being one myself,) was considered in the fervor roused feeling as almost being an enemy; yet, if it had been certain that his future prospects for the presidency would be materially affected by it, I do not believe that the vote on the resolutions would have passed. Or if it had been thought, that Adams would be elected, and if elected, would give Mr. Clay the highest place in his cabinet, there is scarcely a doubt but that the vote would have been in favor of Adams—But the vote was taken under very different suppositions.

For my own part, I have no hesitation in saying that although Jackson is personally preferred to Adams by the people, (an inclination I feel in common with them,) yet if it were known that Jackson would give such direction to the course of his administration by his appointments or otherwise, as to foster Adams' future views in preference to Clay's, there would be but one sentiment among the supporters of the latter in Kentucky. They would consider it as a desertion of the true Western interests, which they feel vitally connected with the great principles advocated by Mr Clay, and which they con-

ceive in a great measure depend for their consummation upon the success of his future exertions. If, therefore, it should be perceived that the tendency of General Jackson's measures as President, would be to supplant Mr. Clay by promoting the views of Adams, then I have no doubt that the voice of all those who are in favor of Mr. Clay would be, "If we are doomed to have Mr. Adams as President at some time, let us have him now; if he has General Jackson's preference, let the General himself make way for him. We should rather have him now at the expense of Jackson, than hereafter at the expense of Clay. But if Jackson gives earnest that he will throw his weight into the Western scale, then let us throw our weight into his." This, I believe would be the decision of three fourths of the people of Kentucky.

—

(No. 12)

FRANKFORT, Jan. 21st, 1825.

Dear Sir: Our Legislature is gone, but have left us no repose. We have a prospect of a contest more embittered than ever. I regret it, and would gladly escape from it; but the fates seem to order it otherwise. I may mistake; but I think the Legislature will be sustained. The excitement is among those opposed to removing the judges by any means.

As I informed you, the resolutions requesting you to vote for Jackson passed; and you have doubtless received them. Jackson is my second choice, all circumstances being equal between him and Adams. But if our interest in the west can be promoted by any other arrangement, I shall be content. At any rate, let us have a President. I would sooner vote for any of the three than have a Vicegerent for four years. Do what you think best—the Argus will not complain, because it has faith that you will do nothing to compromit the interests of the western country, or the nation.

Sincerely your friend,

AMOS KENDALL.

—

(No. 13.)

FRANKFORT, March 8th, 1828.

Dear Sir: Yours of yesterday was received last night. But for my absence for most of the last week, should have written to you on the subject to which it relates.

Many of your friends here have felt dissatisfaction with your address to the public, much deeper than I have expressed in the Argus. They have urged me to procure proof of your declarations; but as I do not wish to take a step which would injure you by showing a seeming conflict between your public and private statements I have put them off by telling them I would write to you for a further explanation. If you are guilty of any thing criminal, so am I, Blair, Crittenden, and many others. We knew that Clay was to be Secretary, and for that reason promoted Adams' election. You did no more. Clay's denunciations have deterred me from avowing my agency; for their was no harm in it. I have always thought your best defence was an open avowal of the facts. Clay has made them criminal in himself; by his own denunciations; but why should you place yourself in the same attitude that he has? Why should you give to the world a statement which conveys the impression that you were not actuated by any regard for Clay's advancement in your vote for Mr. Adams? J. T. Johnson told me, under, the impression that he should be called out in the Senate, that you told him you were in a caucus, and questioned Mr. Clay as to his relation with Jackson and Adams, and whether the latter would make him Secretary of State; that he then retired, and from his answers and other circumstances, you made up your mind to vote for Mr. Adams, having no doubt that he would make Mr. Clay Secretary. In Barry's room last winter, you made a similar statement in presence of myself, B. Johnson, G. E. Russell, Dr. Sharp, and many others. To many of us you have often said, that you voted for Mr. Clay and not for Mr. Adams.

God knows I do not wish to do you any injury, especially as you have been so brutally persecuted by knaves whom you honestly aided in accomplishing their purposes. It seems to me that a plain narrative of the facts and circumstances which led you to conclude that Mr. Adams would make Mr. Clay Secretary, with the letters from your constituents, would form a complete and triumphant vindication.

Your friend, AMOS KENDALL.

—

LETTER V.—CONCLUDED.

TO HENRY CLAY, ESQUIRE,

Secretary of State of the United States.

The following are the documents omitted last week for want of room, to which is annexed the letter of Mr. Tanner. The circumstances detailed by him as occurring in 1822, I had totally forgotten; but I have no doubt of their entire truth. I did not remember that a living man, except Mr. Clay, knew that I was the author of "Wayne," and if Mr. Blair was apprised of the fact, I know not how he got the information, and if I ever did know, I have forgotten it. The world will now have seen, that had I been disposed to "violate private correspondence," I could have furnished the Washington Jackson Committee with some facts which would materially have aided them in their "Reply" to Mr. Clay's Address.

—

(No. 1.)

WASHINGTON, 18th Oct. 1825.

Dear Sir: I received your obliging letter of the 4th inst. With respect to what has been or may be said about the desire which I had to engage your services in the Department of State, I should be sorry if it gave you any concern. To me it is utterly indifferent. It is enough for me to know that I was influenced by no improper motive, and that I was guided solely by the consideration that your industry, capacity and integrity might be beneficially employed for the public in that department. To guard against improper suspicions, you will remember that I told you, if you came into it, I did not wish you to enter it until after the close of the late political campaign in Kentucky. I had known you for a long time—from Mrs. Clay, Clay, as a member of my family—and personally, as the Editor of the Argus. Although I believed you to be wrong in your State politics, no difference in opinion between on[illegible]t sub-

ject, could prevent my making a fair estimate of your endowments.

No change has occurred in the office since my return; and unless a clerkship should be created or become vacant, I do not know that I could offer you any other than that which you thought it your interest to decline. As it was originally made without reference to your agency in K. politics, or to the then state of them, the recent change would have no effect on my wishes to engage you in the public service.

I regret extremely the prospect which you describe, of a renewal, with increased bitterness, of our unhappy local controversy. I think your party is wrong; that they should hasten to forget the past, and unite, for the future, in advancing the true interests of the State, without indulging in unavailing regrets. As to the calumnies of which you and they believe themselves to have been the object, you should despise and outlive them. Besides, no doubt many calumnies have been levelled at individuals of the opposite party, and upon the whole they probably neutralize each other. The causes which led to the ascendancy of your party were in their nature, temporary, and they have gone by. If you presevere, I have no doubt that the result of the next election will be, to place you in a still smaller minority than you now are.—And the very effort which is making to thwart the recent decisive expression of the public will cannot fail to augment the present majority. I know how a defeated party deludes itself by assigning to sinister causes, rather than to the true one, their loss of, or failure to acquire the ascendancy. It is the same thing every where and in all times with the losing party.—A strong illustration of this remark is furnished by the Argus of the 6th instant. You there labor to show that, by a small change of votes, in a few counties, where the majorities of your adversaries happened to be small, you might have prevailed. But, my dear sir, take the opposite side; suppose a small change in some of the counties where your majorities happened to be small; do you not see how the present number in the H. of R. against you might have been augmented?

As to the intention of some of the relief gentlemen to attack the administration, and especially me, I can only say that it is their clear right to do it, if they please. If, by the allegation that I have interfered and contributed to their defeat, they only mean that my opinion was against them, on the act of the last session, and that I did not conceal my opinion, they are perfectly correct. If they mean any thing else, they err. I certainly wished success to the party which has prevailed on that question. But during my last visit to Kentucky I neither had time nor inclination to do more than express my opinion, which was not very often done. It was very well known before. I count in the relief party, many of my best personal and political friends, and I can never believe that the wish to assail me extends beyond a few, whom I well know. If it is imagined that Gen. Jackson can be elected against Mr. Adams, no calculation, in my humble opinion, will be found to be more erroneous. I believe that, in a contest between those two, (always carrying along that the course of administration shall be what I believe it will be, during the next three years,) Mr. Adams will prevail by a majority of two thirds of the Union. He will succeed, in my judgment, against any competitor; but there is another much more formidable than Gen. Jackson.

In frankly expressing these sentiments, it is not my intention to discourage you from the pursuit of what you may deem to be your duty.—I thought they were due to the friendly relations which have subsisted between us. I certainly am anxious to see harmony and concord once more restored to our distracted State; but if a sense of duty impels the combatants to continue the strife, I can only deplore a state of things so inauspicious. At a distance, and full of other cares, I shall look on as a spectator, reserving always the right, upon that and every other human occasion, freely to express my thoughts.

I am truly your friend, &c.

H. CLAY.

AMOS KENDALL, ESQ.

(No. 2.)

WASHINGTON, 8th Jan. 1820.

DEAR SIR: I duly received your obliging favor of the 24th ult. The day before it arrived, I had written to Bibb and to Mr. Smith of the H. of R. authorizing them to give any publicity to the fact that they may think proper, that I did not wish to be considered a candidate for the next Governor. It would have been very gratifying to me to have been able to comply with the wishes of those estimable friends who urged me to offer; but it appeared to me that the same considerations which I think require me to leave Congress, are equally opposed to my acceptance of the office of Governor of K.

The Missouri question is that which engrosses most of the thoughts and attention of the members at present. There is a profound interest felt on that question here. The subject has been started, it is believed by many, for the purpose of arraying one portion of the U. States against another; and there is some reason to apprehend that this sinister design may be effected.

Our Spanish affairs have given rise to many diversified views of the course which this government ought to adopt; and I have never seen less coincidence in opinion among the members of Congress. At the commencement of the session, I do not believe there were ten members who concurred in the recommendation of the President. Even yet, I do not think the number great. Still, the influence of the Executive is almost irresistible, and it is possible that it may ultimatly persuade a majority to believe that the treaty is binding, and even that it is for our interest to execute it. With regard to the Patriots, all the premises of the President pointed to one conclusion; that is, a recognition of them; yet he recommended the passage of further laws to enforce our neutrality; in other words, further laws against them.

I am anxious to know what our Legislature will do to relieve the country.

With great regard, I am cordially yours,

H. CLAY

P. S Do not publish this letter.

(No. 3.)

WASHINGTON, 16th April, 1820.

DEAR SIR: I received your favor of the 22d ult. requesting a copy of Mr. Lancaster's book, which communicates his method of instruction. Not knowing where to obtain it, nor indeed what particular work of his you refer to, I have written to Mr. Lancaster himself to procure it, and when obtained, it shall be forwarded to you.

You will see from the papers, that I have brought forward the subject of the Florida treaty. I believe I may venture to say, that a large majority of the House of Representatives concurred with me in opinion respecting that treaty. Still there were many who, whilst they condemned it, did not think it right to anticipate the subject and express disapprobation. Under these circumstances, I thought it most prudent not to press the resolutions to a vote, but to leave them undecided, believing that the discussion of the subject alone would be productive of good, both on the negotiation and in the nation. There is a rumor in the City which will astonish you, in regard to the conclusion of that treaty. It has been asserted by a member of Congress, as coming from high authority, that, prior to the conclusion of the treaty, it was known to Mr. Adams that we could have obtained more than was conveyed to us; that is, that the Spanish negotiator was allowed, by his instructions, to grant us more, but that less was taken, because the Spanish minister declared, if he went up to his instructions, he should be afraid of some personal injury, upon his return home! What will you, in the West, think of the wisdom of that policy which consents to surrender an important part of our territory from such a motive?

You will see that an abortive attempt at a Caucus has been made. How it was got up, by whom, and for what purpose, is not known. The evening proved bad, and it was thinly attended. It would have been defeated, if the night had been otherwise. About the period that it was first talked of, I understood that my name was used as Vice-President, on the contingency of Tompkins' election as Governor of New York. That circumstance of course imposed certain restraints upon me, and I did not attend the meeting. As soon, however, as it was known that if the Caucus expressed any opinion it would be in my favour, the friends of every pretender to the presidency got to work to defeat the Caucus, and to defeat my recommendation. They said, it wont do to put Mr Clay there; he will be abreast with us, if not before us; and it is best to circumscribe the field of competition. Now, it may be very good for them to do so; but is it for the good people of the United States?

After all, I am assured by well informed friends that, if there had been any recommendation in Caucus, I would have been supported by a very decided majority.

Caucuses are instruments susceptible of very great abuse. They ought, therefore, if ever used, to be but seldom employed. It is, however, a little amusing to see our Virginia friends so warmly reprobating them. There was no objection to them, on their part, when any risk attended Mr. M.'s election. There will be no objection to them, again, when a citizen of Virginia happens to be proposed for one of the highest offices, and he is in any hazard of losing his election.

I write you confidentially, and of course do not wish what I do write to be published.

We shall adjourn from the 1st to 15th May.

Yours faithfully, H. CLAY.

AMOS KENDALL, Esq.

(No. 5.)

WASHINGTON, 16th Feb. 1823.

Dear Sir: I have just received your favor of the 2d inst. I wrote a few days ago to our friend Crittenden, and must refer you to that letter for some topics not touched in this. With respect to the question whether, after the conclusion of the treaty of Louisiana, the right did not accrue to the British, under that of 1783, to navigate the Mississippi in its whole extent, I hope you will not commit yourself until I see you. My opinion is very strong that it did not; and although your suggestions are ingenious, I do not think them conclusive. I have not time here to discuss the question. But I would ask if more can be granted than the grantor has? What had the United States to grant in 1763? What was the consideration which the British paid? Although in name it was a grant of the right of navigation, in the whole extent of the river, the grant must be interpreted, not by its *words*, but by the power to grant. The equivalent given, was measured by what was received. The case of a grant of a right of way by a private individual will not illustrate the argument, because the grantee might have been deceived. Here England was not deceived, because she knew how far we had power to grant. We procured from Spain a right of deposit by the treaty of 1795. Did that also inure to England? If, when we got a *part* of the subject, she could not claim to be let in under the treaty of 1783, how can she assert the claim when we got the whole? If England had tendered to us a part of the fifteen millions which we paid for Louisiana proportionate to the right claimed by her to navigate the river, within the former limits of Spain, she might then have made out a case, not of right, but strongly addressing itself to our equity.

The treaty of Louisiana furnishes another strong illustration. France by it was to be put on the footing of the most favored nation. After the convention of London in 1815, France claimed to be put, in regard to the tonnage of the respective countries, upon the same footing with England. But our government, through Mr. Adams, said, no, we have received pay from England for that privilege, and when you pay us the same (that is, adopt the principles of reciprocity) you shall be admitted as the vessels of England are admitted.

Do you put it on the ground that the inhabitants of the head of a stream have a right to follow it to the ocean, although its debouchement belongs to another power? England at least could not take that ground, because she refuses to allow the application of the principle to the case of the St. Lawrence.

When I shall have the pleasure of seeing you, we will further discuss this matter.

Mr. Talbot promised to day to send you one of Mr. Adams's books which I never saw until I came here. I will see that it is done.

Judging from present appearances, the contest will be between Mr. Adams and me. Mr. Crawford's prospects have greatly and evidently declined within the last three months. Still there may be other phases exhibited before the question is settled. I think, therefore, that the policy of my friends should be that of maintaining at least respectful relations with the other gentlemen and their friends. That is the best course under all circumstances. You may rely upon it, that New York is perfectly uncommitted; that Mr. Crawford does not stand better there than I do, if so well now; that my cause is gaining whilst he is losing ground in that State; and that in Pennsylvania my prospect is far better than either his or Mr. Adams'. In two of the three great States, with which the decision of the question now mainly rests, I stand better than Mr. Crawford, and in two better than Mr. Adams. Mr. Calhoun is generally thought to be entirely out of the question.

Our Virginia business has taken a most unexpected turn. Whilst I certainly should regret that the seeds should have been sown of a permanent alienation between the two States, I do think that we have been so right and they so wrong, that some notice ought to be taken in our papers, in pretty strong terms, of the rejection of the guaranty. I am not sure, that it might not have good effect on the very question, respecting which your solitude exists, for the preservation of the harmony between the two States.

In your notices of Mr. Adams, I need scarcely repeat the idea of the great advantage which will attend a perfectly decorous course. I do not know that I can add any suggestions that will be useful. As I hope to be at home early in the spring it will be then time enough to make any that may occur.

The prospect of war between France and Spain seems to have diminished.

The rumour of a cession of Cuba to England I do not believe is well founded.

With great regard, I am faithfully yours,

H. CLAY.

Amos Kendall, Esq.

MR. TANNER'S LETTER.

Harrodsburg, July 1st, 1828.

Dear Sir—You ask me to inform you how I came to the knowledge that you were the writer of the publications signed "Wayne." In answer, I will briefly state, that at the time you were writing those numbers, I was in your employ as printer, boarded in your house, and slept in the room you occupied as an office. As one of the compositors who worked on the newspaper, I always was permitted to have free access to your manuscript. It was in the exercise of this permission, that I noticed these communications, and believing them to be intended to be published in the Argus, I read them. I then discovered that they were not intended to appear in your own paper, and asked you to explain their object. You informed me that they had been written at the request or *for* Mr. Clay, and that they were first to be published in Ohio. You mentioned the effect that they were intended to produce, and that you had made them as strong as possible; but informed me that Mr. Clay did not wish it known that they were written by you, and that I need say nothing about it. I was then young, and of course not much acquainted with the devices of political men. I had viewed Mr. Clay as a very great man, and was a little surprised that he should get you to write communications *for him*. I so often thought about it, that it made a lasting impression upon me. Before these papers were taken from your office, Mr. Clay supped with you. If I do not mistake, Mr. Josiah Wheeler (now of Oldham county) and his lady supped with you that evening. I supposed, when I saw him at your house and knew that he had been with you all the evening, that he had been examining your communications, and I presume I was right; for they were not next day in the room. It was some time after that before they made their appearance in the Cincinnati Gazette. I believe I was the first, however, that recognized them and told you of it. You then published them in the Argus, and the many corrections which you made in them a little astonished the hands in the office. I alone knew why you took that liberty, but did not mention the circumstance.

Although the circumstances of that publication were always vivid in my recollection, when thinking of Mr Clay's claims to the Presidency, I did not advert to it, or mention it to a single individual for some years. I long after that retained my *veneration*, as I may term it, for his talents and his political character. I, after that, received from him some little patronage, and at one time a complimentary letter of recommendation for a commercial friend in Louisville, where I lent to him my feeble support while the conductor of a newspaper. Through all these vicissitudes, however, I never forgot the "Wayne" communications. I thought that to procure the pen of another man to abuse without measure a political rival, exhibited a species of intrigue that my maiden knowledge of political men had not entirely convinced me was in accordance with the most honorable conduct. But I still thought it was nothing more than others would do under like circumstances, and I overlooked it. And it was not until Mr. Clay had voted for the man that I knew he had lavished such abuse on as is contained in those numbers, that I could not reconcile such daring profligacy. Those communications and your letters published by me for Mr. Clay, were the foundation upon which I mainly rested my objections to Mr. Adams. I thought that Henry Clay would not misrepresent him, and if he did not, Mr. Adams was a bad man. And after this, to see him make a man President, whom he had taught me to dislike, I could no longer palliate his conduct. My veneration was dissolved.

It was in giving my reasons for withdrawing my affections from Mr. Clay as a politician, that I sometimes spoke of the publications of "Wayne." I introduced the subject into my newspaper last fall, and called your attention and others to it last winter. You recollect how much you were surprized when I mentioned the subject to you, and you thought there was no person who knew any thing about it. When I related some of the circumstances here repeated, you then remembered them. I believe, however, Mr. Blair was also acquainted with the facts of the publication, whether ob-

tained from you or Mr. Clay, I cannot say.

Repectfully yours,

WILLIAM TANNER.

Mr. A. KENDALL.

Extract from the Introduction to the unpublished Anas of Mr. Jefferson.

In these three volumes will be found copies of the official opinions given in writing by me to Gen. Washington, while Secretary of State, with some times the documents belonging to the case. Some of these are the rough draughts, some press copies, some fair ones. In the earlier part of my acting in that office, I took no other note of the passing transactions, but, after a while, I saw the importance of doing it, in aid of my memory. Very often therefore I made memorandums on loose scraps of paper, taken out of my pocket in the moment, and laid by to be copied fair at leisure, which however they hardly ever were. These scraps therefore, ragged, rubbed, and scribbled as they were, I had bound with the others by a binder who came into my cabinet, laid it under my own eye, and without the opportunity of reading a single paper. At this day, after the lapse of 25 years, or more, from their dates, I have given to the whole a calm revisal, when the passions of the time are past away, and the reasons of the transactions set alone on the judgment. Some of the informations I had recorded are now cut out from the rest, because I have seen that they were incorrect, or doubtful, or personal, or private, with which we have nothing to do.

* * * * * *

But Hamilton was not only a Monarchist, but for a Monarchy bottomed on corruption. In proof of this I will relate an anecdote, for the truth I attest the God who made me. Before the President set out on his southern tour in April 1791, he addressed a letter of the 14th of that month, from Mount Vernon to the Secretaries of State, the Treasury and War, desiring that, if any important case should arise during his absence, they would consult and act on them, and he requested that the Vice President should also be consulted. This was the only occasion on which that officer was ever requested to take part in a Cabinet question. Some occasion of consultation arising I invited those gentlemen (and the Attorney General, as well as I remember) to dine with me in order to confer on the subject. After the cloth was removed, and our question agreed and dismissed, conversation began on other matters, and by some circumstance, was led to the British Constitution, on which Mr. Adams observed "purge that Constitution of its corruption, and give to its popular branch equality of representation, and it would be the most perfect constitution devised by the wit of man." Hamilton paused and said, "purge it of its corruption, and give to its popular branch equality of representation, and it would become an *impracticable* government: as it stands at present, with all its supposed defects, it is the most perfect government which ever existed." And this was assuredly the exact line which seperated the political creeds of these two gentlemen. The one was for two hereditary branches and an honest elective one: the other for a hereditary King with a house of Lords and Commons, corrupted to his will, and standing between him and the people. Hamilton was indeed a singular character. Of acute understanding, disinterested, honest and honorable in all private transactions, amiable in society, and duly valuing virtue in private life, yet so bewildered and perverted by the British example as to be under a thoro' conviction that corruption was essential to the government of a nation. Mr. Adams had originally been a republican, the glare of royalty and nobility, during his mission to England, had made him believe their fascination a necessary ingredient in government, and Shay's rebellion, not sufficiently understood where he then was, seemed to prove that the absence of want and oppression was not a sufficient guarantee of order. His book on the American Constitutions having made known his political bias, he was taken up by the Monarchical Federalists, in his absence, and on his return to the U. S. he was by them made to believe that the general disposition of our citizens was favorable to Monarchy. He here wrote his Davila as a supplement to the former work, and his election to the Presidency confirmed his errors. Innumerable addresses too, artfully and industriously poured in upon him, deceived him into a confidence that he was on the pinacle of prosperity, when the gulph was yawning at his feet which was to swallow up him and his deceivers. For when General Washington was withdrawn, these energumeni of royalism, kept in check hitherto by the dread of his honesty, his firmness, his patriotism, and the authority of his name, now mounted on the car of State and free from controul, like Phaeton on that of the Sun, drove headlong and wild, looking neither to right nor left, nor regarding any thing but the objects they were driving at: until displaying these fully, the eyes of the nation were opened, and a general disbandment of them from the public councils took place.—Mr. Adams, I am sure, has been long since convinced of the treacheries with which he was surrounded during his administration. He has since thoroughly seen that his constituents were devoted to republican government, and whether his judgment is re-settled on its ancient basis, or not, he is conformed as a good citizen to the will of the majority, and would now, I am persuaded, maintain its republican structure, with the zeal and fidelity belonging to his character. For even an enemy has said "he is always an honest man and often a great one," but in the fury and follies of those who made him their stalking horse, no man who did not witness it, can form an idea of their unbridled madness, and the terrorism with which they surrounded themselves. The horrors of the French revolution then raging aided them mainly, and using this as a raw head and bloody bones they were enabled by their stratagems * * * * their tales of tub-plots, ocean massacres, bloody buoys, and pulpit lying and slanderings, and maniacal ravings of their Gardeners, their Osgoods and Parishes, to spread alarm into all but the firmest breasts. Their Attorney General had the impudence to say to a republican member that deportation must be resorted to, of which, said he you republicans have set the example, thus daring to identify us with the murderous Jacobins of France.—These transactions, now recollected but as dreams of the night,

were then sad realities, and nothing rescued us from their liberticide effect but the unyielding opposition of those firm spirits who sternly maintained their post, in defiance of terror, until their fellow-citizens could be aroused to their own danger, and rally, and rescue the standard of the constitution. This has been happily done. Federalism and monarchism have languished from that moment, until their treasonable combinations with the enemies of their country during the late war. Their plots of dismembering the union, and their Hartford Convention, has consigned them to the tomb of the dead; and I fondly hope we may now truly say "we are all republicans all federalists," and that the motto of the standard to which our country will forever rally, will be "Federal union, and Republican Government," and sure I am we may say that we are indebted, for the preservation of this point or ralliance to that opposition

* * * * * * *

Much of this relation is notorious to the world and many intimate proofs of it will be found in these notes.—From the moment, where they end, of my retiring from the administration, the Federalists got unchecked hold of General Washington. His memory was already sensibly impaired by age, the firm tone of mind for which he had been remarkable, was beginning to relax, its energy was abated; a listlessness of labor, a desire for tranquility had crept on him, and a willingness to let others act and even think for him. Like the rest of mankind he was disgusted with the atrocities of the French revolution, and was not sufficiently aware of the difference between the rabble who were used as the instruments of their perpetration, and the steady and rational character of the American people, in which he had not sufficient confidence. The opposition too of the republicans to the British treaty, and zealous support of the Federalists in that unpopular, but favorite measure of theirs, had made him all their own. Understanding moreover that I disapproved of that treaty, and copiously nourished with falsehoods by a malignant neighbor of mine, who ambitioned to be his correspondent, he had become alienated from myself personally, as from the republican body generally of his fellow citizens; and he wrote the letters to Mr. Adams, and Mr. Carroll, over which, in devotion to his imperishable fame, we must for ever weep as monuments of mortal decay.

TH. JEFFERSON.

Feb. 4th, 1818.

From the Louisville Advertiser.

We insert below, the promised letter of JOHN POPE, Esq. which, as will be observed, was written in reply to a letter from us, on the subject of the approaching election. Mr. Pope's views of the subject are able and unanswerable, and we are happy to add, that he is acting on them—zealously supporting the election of Barry and Breathitt, in private conversation and in public addresses.

Mr. Penn—Owing to my absence from this county during the last winter and spring, indisposition and my necessary attention to private business, I am not able to give you very satisfactory information of the state of public sentiment in this quarter, in relation to the candidates for Governor and Lt. Governor. I entertain no doubt that two-thirds, probably more, of the voters in this county, are in favor of the election of Gen. Jackson. There appears to be some division in the Jackson party about the candidates for Governor. An opinion has been circulated with great industry, that the election of Governor has no connection with that of President. Mr. Underwood a few days ago, in a public speech, with great candor and propriety, told the people that he considered the old and new court question settled. The people begin to understand that this unpleasant controversy is disposed of, and that we are not now trying the validity of the reorganizing act. On this subject the partisans of the administration have played a most dexterous game, but their success will be temporary—it will not last until the first Monday in August.

The administration convention, in December, selected Gen. Metcalfe as their candidate for Governor, and he must be considered identified with that party in his contest. He was one of our representatives in Congress who voted against General Jackson contrary to the will of the State, as expressed through the General Assembly.

The new court law was decided on by the people several years ago, has been repealed and the old state of things restored, and is not now a question in the pending contest. It must be clearly understood that the administration party, in presenting Gen. Metcalfe as their candidate, put the question directly to the people of Kentucky: "Do you or do you not approve the conduct of your representatives in voting at the last Presidential election against General Jackson, in opposition to the solemn, urgent and almost unanimous declaration of the General Assembly?" If the people, in the present aspect of the controversy, elect Gen. Metcalfe, it will be claimed, and very properly, not only as an acquittal by Kentucky of the charges against Adams, Clay, &c. but as a triumph of Mr. Clay and his friends, upon the very principle in contest. It must be so viewed here and by the people of other States. The eyes of the nation are upon us, looking with anxious solicitude to the result of the present contest for Governor in Kentucky. The election of General Metcalfe will be deemed an approbation by Kentucky of the vote of her representatives in Congress at the last Presidential election. The friends of General Jackson should examine and consider this matter well before they decide, and suffer a defeat, which may be fatal, not only to his cause in Kentucky, but have an unfortunate influence in other States.—Can Jackson men, consistently with their professions and the ground they occupy in relation to the Presidential contest, support the election of Gen. Metcalfe? The constitution provides that, when the electors fail to make a choice, the election shall be made by the House of Representatives from the three highest voted for by the electors, and in making the choice they shall vote by States, each State having one vote. Whether the representatives of a State, in making the choice, should regard the will of the State represented, is the leading subject of inquiry now presented to the consideration of the Republican people of Kentucky? I understand

the administration party to contend, that the representatives have the right of choice, regardless of the will of the State—the Jackson party insist that the Representatives ought to have regarded that will. This seems to be the great principle in contestation. When the electors vote, they act in conformity to the will of the people represented, and when the election is made by the States, the representatives in Congress should exercise the power in conformity to the will of the States represented. Some, indeed, contend, that the representatives bear no relation to the States, but are to look to the particular districts they respectively represent. The absurdity of this will be apparent upon a single suggestion:—Suppose, from sickness or other cause, a majority of the representatives of the State had been absent when the election took place, and only one, two or three members had been present to give the vote of Kentucky?—when called on to give the vote of this State, was it their duty to give the vote of one, two or three districts, or the vote of the State? This subject is the more interesting, when it is considered that the election by electors is made in December, and the election by the House of Representatives on the 19th of February following. Unless the will of the State be made known through their General Assembly, it will be impracticable to obtain it in any other mode, and the doctrine advanced in the Circular of the Clay Committee, in 1824, must prevail. We were told in that famous document, that, if the election should come before Congress, the voice of the people would no more be heard, and that every thing would be carried by the influence and intrigue, bargain and management'—and are the free people of Kentucky prepared to put their seal of approbation on this doctrine by electing one of those who, by his vote at the last Presidential election, gave it countenance?—This is not a contest about men, but important, vital principle. Were the candidates alone concerned, I should take no part in the controversy. Their relative merits and qualifications are of minor importance—they are all I believe, highly respectable. A late Address of the friends of the administration to the people of the United States, merits the particular attention of the Jackson party. In this Address, the pending contest in Kentucky for the office of Governor is noticed with much interest, and a hope, indeed a confident expectation expressed, of the success of Gen. Metcalfe, the administration candidate, and of the great influence his success will have on the Presidential election. Can the friends of the Jackson cause lend their aid to accomplish what the friends of the administration predict will have an important effect in defeating the election of Gen. Jackson? Can they be neutral in such a contest? Whatever use the administration party may make of the old and new court question, to divide and weaken the Jackson force, it is evident, not only from the candid declarations of Mr. Underwood, but the acts of the party, that they do not consider that question now before the people in this contest—Last year, in the county of Woodford, where there is a majority of old court men, an old and a new court man was selected by the administration party as candidates for the Legislature. In Jefferson county a new court man was elected, and received the general support of the administration party. In Henry county, Mr. Charles Allen, a decided new court man, is a prominent candidate on the side of the administration. One of the Adams electoral ticket is a prominent and and decided new court man—and Mr. Kendall, while exerting his Editorial powers in support of the re-organizing act, received an offer from Mr. Clay of a situation in the Department of State; nor did Mr. Clay visit him with any special mark of his displeasure, until the new court party was prostrate, and he indicated his intention to oppose the administration.

Gen. Metcalfe does not seem to have any very high claim to public consideration on account of his course on the old and new court question. The difference between him and Major Barry consists in this—that while Barry openly met the odium and responsibility of the measure, Gen. Metcalfe observed a profound if not mysterious silence.

With regard to the occupant question, which seems to be very foreign to the subject in contest, I have only to observe, that I have not the journals to enable me to understand Maj. Barry's votes eighteen or twenty years ago, upon the various propositions to alter or modify our occupant laws; but it is due to him to state, in 1821, when I was a member of the House of Representatives, he was a zealous supporter of the measures then devised in opposition to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States' declaring our occupant laws unconstitutional. From the tenor of some of the handbills and publications circulated by the administration party, it would seem that all their sympathies are awakened for the poor suffering occupants, and that their security is the cardinal object of their solicitude: and yet I suspect that, if a friend of the occupant and of General Jackson was put in competition for office, with an enemy to the occupant and a friend to the administration, it would not be difficult to determine which the administration party would support; and, it is probable a new court administration man would find support against an old court Jackson man. I do not mention these things in a spirit of reproach, but to expose the futility of such objections and the insincerity of their authors. They ought to be lost sight of, in the magnitude of the contest now pending at the bar of the nation.

It is well known that I did not approve the selection of the candidate presented by the Jackson party for the office of governor. I really feared that the conspicious attitude he had occupied in the new court rank, would render it difficult to unite the Jackson party for him. I am conscious I was actuated by no selfish or personal consideration. Some circumstances connected with the nomination would forbid my interference, did I not believe that the good of the Jackson cause demanded my exertions.

I will not discuss the relative merits or qualifications of Gen. Jackson or Mr. Adams. In some respects Mr. Adams may be better informed and qualified than Gen. Jackson—in others, I have no doubt Gen. Jackson would make a better President than Mr. Adams. They are both distinguished and talented men, and either qualified for the office. The cant phrase of "military chieftain" would not deserve notice but for the grave manner in which it is urged upon the consideration of the American people.

All experience has proved, I think, that great military men are generally best suited for executive stations. Their military habits and feelings incline them to fill the public offices with the most fit men, and their firmness and desision of character, afford to the people a better guarantee against maladministration, than is to be found in intriguing and popularity hunting politicians. The apprehensions of danger from the election of Gen. Jackson is, to my mind, idle and imaginary. Can any man in his sober senses believe, that one who has fought for the liberties of his country, from his youth to old age, would suddenly engage in a Quixotic scheme to overturn them, and at the very moment when he is rewarded with the first honor in the gift of the people? What renders this alarm the more ridiculous, is, that the President has no power to declare war, to raise armies or revenue—these important powers being vested in Congress. No sir—the people have more to fear from intrigue and management in the representative body: the want of fidelity there is the canker that corrodes the purity of the body politic and opens the gates of the city of freedom to some daring usurper. The remarks of an enlightened commentator on the reign of Henry VIII. of England, the most cruel and tyrannical Prince that ever disgraced the English throne, merits the serious consideration of every reflecting statesman. This reign [says he] teaches us the most alarming of all political truths; that the most absolute despotism may prevail in a State, and yet the form of a free constitution remain. Henry never attempted to abolish the Parliament, or even to retrench its doubtful privileges. The Parliament was the grand instrument of his tyrannies. The conclusion he draws from the history of this reign is, that, if Britons should ever be slaves, such an event is not likely to happen, as in France or Spain, by the abolition of the national assembly, but by the corruption of its members—by making the supposed bulwark of liberty, as in ancient Rome, the means of slavery. We should bear in mind, that when by any contrivance or management, an election is defeated in the first instance and carried into Congress, the election is to be made by the States of the Union, each State, without regard to its population, having one vote. The last election was made by twenty four votes—one from each State—the Representatives of each State gave the vote of the State. To guard against the abuse of the power vested in that body, it is of more importance to maintain the controlling influence of the public will of the States, than seems to be generally conceded. When a State acts as a State, in its corporate political character, it must act and speak by and through its representative body—that is the appropriate and only practicable mode of action.

The General Assembly is the medium of expressing the sovereign will of the State. Whether the sentiment contained in the address of the Clay committee, that, when the election is to be made by Congress, the voice of the people is no more to be heard—whether our representatives in Congress at the last election ought to have regarded the will of the State as declared by the General Assembly, and especially if they believed the declaration to be true, are matters of deep and vital import, and now directly presented to the special consideration of Kentucky, and upon which the people are called on to express their opinion, at the approaching election. The official alliance between Messrs. Adams and Clay—the personal and selfish motives which may have influenced the vote—are but circumstances of aggravation. The main question is—ought the public will to have been regarded? The more we reflect on the theory, and observe the practical operations of this great confederation, the more we shall be impressed with the necessity of preserving in the State representative bodies, efficient checks against the encroachments and abuses of federal power.—They are not only necessary, but indispensable bulwarks to the duration of American freedom. Before the American revolution the British parliament claimed the right of taxing the colonies without their consent. This arrogant pretension was resisted by the colonies through the representative bodies, assembled in various modes—and the representative bodies were the efficient agents through which public sentiment was displayed and a stand made against the principle contended for.

Ours is a representative government, and, when we act, as States, we must act through our assembled representatives. There, the public will must be embodied and produced—nor does this doctrine conflict with the right of the people to act upon their representatives by petition, address or remonstrance, or any other practicable and orderly mode of expressing their opinions on public affairs. The parliament claimed the right to tax the colonies without their consent—the colonies resisted it by a seven years war. What is now claimed for our representatives in Congress, when the election of President is devolved on that body?—that the voice of the people is no more to be heard—and although representing the States; they have a right to make a President without the consent of the States, and against their will, expressed through their constitutional representative assemblies! Are those who protest against this extravagant assumption to be called a factious, wicked combination? Let the people weigh these things with deliberation, and decide with firmness what ground enlightened freemen should occupy in the pending struggle. The principle involved is one of no ordinary magnitude, the force of which ought not to be obscured or weakened, by discussing the propriety of furnishing the Indians with likenesses; or blacking their shoes or mockasins.

I will not descend to the task of examining in detail and defending Gen. Jackson against the assassin-like attacks made on his feelings and pride, in coffin-hand bills and pamphlets, calling him a cruel tyrant and murderer. His military deeds have not been done in a corner, but in the face of the nation and of the public enemy. His conduct has passed the ordeal of his government, and received the plaudits of his country. The name of Jackson is associated with the glory of this republic throughout the civilized world. Is there one honorable man of any party, who feels as an American should feel, whose bosom is not fired with indignation at these wicked and malignant attempts to degrade this great and distinguished hero who has shed so much lustre on our national character? Whether we attribute the victory of New Or-

leans to the consummate skill and genius of the American commander, or consider him a chosen instrument of heaven, to save us in the most gloomy and perilous moment of the war, he is equally entitled to our respect and consideration.

I intended to have written you a short letter, in answer to yours received a few days since by the way of Frankfort, but the interests awakened by the subject has led me to explore the ground of controversy more at large than I anticipated. Before I conclude, I must remind you of an egregious error committed by the advocates of the Jackson cause. They have exagerated too much the prospects of Maj. Barry, and thereby lulled their friends and induced supineness, indifference and neutrality to an alarming degree. The vantage ground gained last year, can only be preserved by vigilance and exertion. Several gentlemen of the administration party have, with great apparent confidence, claimed for Gen. Metcalfe a majority of 5000 votes, and some calculate on 10,000. The Jackson partisans, on the contrary, claim a majority of 5, 10 and even 15,000. A very intelligent Jackson man told me, the other day, that Barry and Breathitt would be elected by a majority of 7000 votes. Now, sir, I believe none of these calculations. I profess to have some knowledge of the state of parties in Kentucky, and feel assured in my own mind, that the successful candidate, whether Barry or Metcalfe, will not, in all probability, obtain a majority of more than 3000. I have believed that there was a majority of 3 or 4000 in favor of the election of General Jackson, and that if they could be united upon the Jackson candidates, their success might be anticipated with tolerable certainty. It may be policy in a minority to exagerate their force, to encourage effort, but a majority should rather underrate than overrate their strength.

It cannot—at least, it ought not to have escaped the observation of the Jackson party, that the friends of the administration, whether new or old court, are one and indivisible. With them there is no bickering, or heart-burning about new and old court—this distinction in that party is buried. Not one of one hundred—indeed, I might say of five hundred, whether new or old court, of the administration party, will vote for the Jackson candidates. I find that, when a new court gentleman gives in his adhesion to the administration, he meets with a ready absolution from his re-organizing sins; and although many of the old court administration men manifest great alarm about the new court question, yet it is not improbable that Gen. Metcalfe's near approach to a re-organizer, constituted a strong motive for his selection. The friends of Gen. Jackson ought to be warned, and solemnly warned, that, upon THEIR UNION depends the success of his cause in Kentucky. If new and old court can unite on the administration candidates, why will the friends of Gen. Jackson *divide?* Are they less hearty in their cause? They must present an undivided and vigorous front to their opponents, or defeat is inevitable. Let them only UNITE, and display the same zeal and energy in the cause of Jackson, that HE did in the cause of his country, and all will be well. I think you may calculate, with tolerable certainty, on a majority of four or five hundred in this county for Major Barry, and it is not improbable that he will receive a majority of seven or eight hundred. As I am not disposed to disguise or conceal my sentiments, and entirely willing to act my part in the face of day, and under the responsibility of my name, you are at liberty, if you think proper, to give this letter a place in your paper

Yours, &c. J. POPE.

Washington County, July 8, 1828.

From the Richmond Enquirer.

PLOT IN THE SOUTH!

The friends of the Administration still insist upon getting up "a plot for the Dissolution of the Union." They are continually bawling out a Plot! a Plot!—A plot is on foot to rend asunder the Union. The citizens of the South are concerned in it. The South Carolinians are to sound the tocsin, and the South is to fall into the ranks. The opponents of the Tariff are to rouse up the people by the magic of that obnoxious measure. The friends of Jackson are to hurry them on to extremities. Rowan predicted there would be a dissolution. Stevenson predicted it. Parker threatened it. There can be no doubt of it—of a secret combination to dissolve the Union. The gunpowder is actually deposited; the train is laid—and it only requires the hand of some modern Guy Fawkes to apply the spark, and blow this federative republic into atoms.

We are not fond of *quizzing* our readers—though the Virginian, who is now sitting quietly under his own vine and fig tree, will scarcely believe how many grave faces are put on, and how many bold assertions are made upon the occasion. The fashion of the Administration gentlemen is to cry out—a Plot to dissever the Union! If there be a Plot no where else, they must contrive to have one in the newspapers. Nothing as yet has put down Gen. Jackson—no lies, no calumnies, no attacks upon his wife, no generous attempts to strip the honored laurel from his brows, no charges of his conspiring with Burr, nothing has yet succeeded in stemming the current of his popularity. No wile, no invention, has touched his character. It has defied the ingenuity of Coffin handbills—and and the audacity of affiliated Editors. It is proof against poison and the dagger. As a desperate resort, they are turning upon his friends—charging them with a serious design of subverting the Union, and plunging their country into blood.

Those who are not in the habit of reading a variety of newspapers, will scarcely believe the active efforts which are making to alarm the public mind and prejudice the cause of Jackson, by the cry of disunion.—We shall seize only a few illustrations of this insidious system. The National Intelligencer asserts "that there is a project on foot for a virtual dissolution of the Union—that the originators of this scheme are among his (Jackson) most decided supporters; nay, more, that they are his *most elevated and talented advocates.*"

The New York American, after quoting the expressions that have been ascribed to Rowan and Stevenson and a Judge in Virginia, breaks out into the following strain: "When to these sentiments of grave senators and judges, are added the inflammatory resolutions and pro-

ceedings of certain districts in South Carolina, the open invitation to a separation of the Union contained in some Jackson journals of that state —and when it is found that in every instance these sentiments are indulged, this most flagitious tone is held by partizans of Gen. Jackson, and by them only, can it be unfair, unreasonable, or unjust, to impute the doctrines thus broached, as the doctrines of the party? As such then we hold them up to the people. We proclaim "*Disunion*" as the creed of Jacksonism—*to rule or ruin*, as their maxim."

The U. S. Gazette of Philadelphia also cants about "the separation of the state," as if it were "subject of familiar discourse and calculation." But the administration men of Baltimore cap the climax of this mock drama. The Baltimore Marylander, under the flourishing title of "*God save the Union*," gives the proceedings of a "crowded and highly respectable assemblage of the *friends of the General Government and the Union of these States* on the 24th inst to take into consideration the late inflammatory proceedings in South Carolina and *elsewhere*." They put "the venerable Collector of the port of Baltimore, the *hero of two wars*, James H. McCulloch," in the chair; he addresseds the meeting—he gravely tells them "that it had been his undeviating practice of late years to abstain from all interference in political matters, but that he regarded the exigencies of the present moment as so important, and the business upon which this meeting would be called deliberate so momentous, that he was compelled to make this case an exception to his general rule, and to forego the comforts of home and a quiet for this occasion."—"This address was received with the *most rapturous applauses*—And after all these attempts *at effect*, Mr. J. S. Tyson produces his preamble and resolutions, which were "*unanimously adopted*." We have no space to spare for such effusions—the resolutions alone will shew the spirit in which they are conceived.

"*Resolved*, That the principles inculcated in the Colleton Address, as well as those avowed in the speech of Mr. George M'Duffie, are hostile to the constitution, treasonable in their spirit, and tending to rebellion.

"*Resolved*, That as we love the Union—the constitution which binds it, and the sacred memory of those whose blood and treasure were drained to establish the *independence* upon which that Union was founded, we will support it to the last, and assist with our lives and fortunes the General Government, whenever it shall become necessary to punish treason and suppress rebellion.

"*Resolved*, That the editors of the various newspapers of this city and all others friendly to the perpetuity of this Union, be respectfully requested to publish the above preamble and resolutions."

All other (Adams) papers will be sure to catch the cue, and sound the tocsin.—And pursuing the earnest advice of the loyal "Marylander," that the *example* of the Baltimore Meeting "will be followed throughout the country," we may look out for similar meetings elsewhere. If the good sense of the people does not stop the idle farce, we shall hear the Adams party breaking out into a full chorus of denunciation and "reprobation."

It is thus that trick after trick is played off—for where is the necessity of such serious appeals to the People? Is there one impartial man who apprehends disunion? Where are the evidences of the plot?

Do we find it in the interests of Andrew Jackson himself? A man whom the public voice is bearing on to the Chief Magistracy—and who will certainly prefer the whole to a divided empire.

In the declarations of Mr. Rowan? Where there is no proof of his having uttered them—and when he himself is directly at points with the citizens of South Carolina about the tariff—*said to be one* of the great bends of union among the conspirators.

Shall we rely upon any general declarations of any gentleman, sent out to the world and stript of all the circumstances which qualify and explain them? Can we believe that any man would boldly divulge a plot which requires the utmost discretion to ripen it—or that he who is indebted to the Union for one of the highest offices within its gift, would be mad enough to promote a plot, whose success would prostrate his own honors and his own interests?

Will they rely upon any anonymous report of the conversations of a gentleman whose whole character is at war with the alleged declaration, and who has himself contradicted it?

They bring up some musty letter written 29 years ago, and charging Mr. Giles with expressing a "desire to see a separation of this State from the General Union." Mr. Giles (the present Governor) peremptorily denied the statement at the time; denied explicitly what he did say in conversation; and now declares that he did not then, nor does he now, nor did he ever desire to see a separation of the United States—nor did he ever express, or hear any other person express such desire, to the best of his recollection.

Where, then, are the proofs of this treason and rebellion? Why, they must at last point us to some anonymous paragraphs in South Carolina—a few hot toasts at public dinners—some party remarks of Mr. McDuffie and the resolutions of 2 or 3 public meeting.—But ought these to implicate a whole State in a grave conspiracy? Or do they admit of any other fair interpretation than that they express the feelings of comparatively a few citizens, some under the goad of oppression, and who are likely to recover their temper with the first moment of returning reflection.

We ask again for the "most elevated and talented advocates" of "disunion" among the friends of Gen Jackson.—Where are they?

Governor Taylor is no Disunionist—He has frankly set his face against resistance to the laws—he refuses to convene the Legislature—and bears testimony to the general moderation of his fellow citizens. He tells the people of Colleton, that no other meeting has come to him with an application similar to theirs, and "it is, therefore, fairly to be inferred, that the measure you ask me to adopt is *no where in our State desired but by those on whose behalf you have made your communication to me.*"

The National Intelligencer was the first to cry out that Governor Taylor "has given the *quietus* to the fearful plot."—Its official colleague, the "National Journal," avered before-

hand, that if "Governor Taylor shall decline to assemble the Legislature, we may hope that this storm will blow over without injury"—and yet both these Journals still continue to harp upon the plot for a dissolution of the Union.

Mr. Vice President Calhoun trusts to "the *good sense and virtue* of the people for a remedy"—and believes that the present "excitement will be restrained within the *bonds of moderation.*" Of course, he is no Disunionist.

Mr. Mitchell (a member of the H. of R.) at a public dinner at Charleston given by the old Revolutionary Society on the 4th July, invites them to "make every constitutional opposition to this most unconstitutional law, and *beware of violent and heedless* measures."

Mr. Martin, another member of Congress, the decided opponent of the Tariff on the Committee of Manufactures, and another decided friend of Jackson, writes to his friend in Washington City: "But friend Gales is neither fair nor candid, when he attempts to magnify it as he does, for a particular purpose. If he really deprecates the consequences which he portrays, as he affects to do, he ought to recollect, that such affaires often acquire importance, which never could have belonged to them, by their being used, precisely as he is using this. *There is no sort of danger of disunion, secession, rebellion, &c.*"

The idea of any rebellion or disunion, under the circumstances of the country, is the merest farce in the world. And yet we have seen and shall see it most gravely urged, to answer "a particular purpose."

But we beg leave to call into court, on the present occasion, two very disinterested witnesses—two Editors of the New York papers who take no active part in politics, and are really neither Trojans nor Tyrians. They are impartial spectators, who see the whole of the game that is going on, and know what to think of it. The first we shall introduce is the "New York Statesman," who gives us not only disinterested opinions but real facts.

"*Sentiments of the South.*—We yesterday conversed with a gentleman from Columbia, South Carolina, the seat of the late acts of violence in that state, and obtained from him some particulars in regard to the feelings of the people, which cannot be gathered from the newspapers. He states that *the great body of the planters and other respectable members of the community* discountenance the violent proceedings of intemperate politicians. *Few persons* of any standing in society were present at the disgraceful scenes in Columbia, and those few were attracted by mere curiosity.

"Our informant adds that the people of South Carolina are adopting the most discreet, efficacious and patriotic of all modes of counteracting the influence of the Tariff—*that of developing and relying on their own resources.* The mountainous districts of the state possess excellent water privileges and peculiar advantages for manufacturing. Public attention has been directed on this subject, as also to the raising of cattle upon lands now unoccupied. The latter expedient will relieve the Carolinians from the payment of a large amount in cash to the western states for beeves, horses, and mules, without any reciprocity in trade.

"It is but justice to remark, that the State of Virginia, much as she is opposed to the tariff, has manifested a degree of moderation on the subject, worthy of her dignity and influence in the Union. Her example has probably had a salutary effect on the warmer temperament of some of her southern neighbors. Her citizens have had the judgment to adopt a system of rigid domestic economy and self-dependence, as the only legitimate means of meeting a policy to which they are opposed.

"We rejoice at these *indications of good sense and sound patriotism, in the Southern States;* for we are not the advocates of the Tariff, as a policy designed to enrich one section of the United States, at the expense of another, but because in our view it is calculated to render us independent of foreign nations, cherish the domestic industry, and promote the permanent prosperity of the whole country."

The next is the N. Y. Journal of Commerce of the same date (the 24th) and expresses itself in the following manner:

"Southern Sentiments.—We are really sorry to see the manner in which some of our papers are continuing to notice the murmurs and movements of the South against the Tariff. We say of the South—for so they speak—tho' it is really only S. Carolina, *(and indeed only a small part of that,)* that has made any show of opposition in the case. The other States of the South, and particularly Virginia, which is the van of them, *are all as quiet and loyal as we could wish.* They feel, to be sure, the evil, and as they thing, the injustice, and inequality, and unconstitutionality of the system—and of the late aggravation of it. And they talk, too, about encouraging their own domestic manufactures, and setting their slaves to making coarse stuffs, and things of that sort. Still *you do not hear them speak of resistance, or disunion, or any thing of the kind.* This is wise, and proper, and becoming. But in South Carolina, it is true, the people, (or some of them,) have not been *altogether* as peaceable and prudent as they might and should have been, and some of them have uttered and published some rash and silly things which, taken by the letter, might mean treason—or any thing else—(for we do not pretend to be able to interpret such ebullitions of feeling very exactly. We "understand a *fury* in the words, but not the words") And these have been *seized upon with great avidity* by our party writers, *and magnified and horrified,* in their way, till we could almost fancy in reading their representations, that the whole of our Southern States, from the Potomac down, were ripe and ready for a dissolution of the Union! *And this they do purely to shew their zeal for the constitution and the confederation, and their anxiety to preserve them with their forces!*

"Now, for our part, we think that these *gross exaggerations and misrepresentations of the state of public sentiment in any quarter of our country,* accompanied as they usually are with invidious and insulting "geographical distinctions," are a thousand times more dangerous to the peace and welfare of our Union, than all that they affect to condemn. And we really wish that those who undertake to enlighten and direct public opinion could be made sensible of the gross folly of proceeding in this way, to inflame the passions which they ought to compose, and in

crease, or, perhaps, create the evils which they pretend to deplore. In the mean time, we are glad to see by our late accounts from the South, that is, from South Carolina, that the "good people" of that State, (with the exception of a few "ardent spirits" among them,) are going about their business in a very peaceable and orderly way and we are quite sure, from the just and generous sentiments that are breaking from them in all directions, that *we shall have neither war, nor separation, from them, this time, nor for a long time to come.* We refer more particularly to the patriotic speech of Gov. Taylor, (at a dinner on the 4th of July,) which we suppose, we may regard as the voice of the State, and a part of which we must give our readers in these words."

Now, this as it should be. The Editor has sense enough to see what is passing, and knows the exact character of those who talk in South Carolina, and those who comment upon their proceedings elsewhere.—We lay all these matters before our readers, and leave them to draw their own comments. But there is one passage in the Speech of Henry Baldwin, Esq. delivered at Pittsburgh on the 4th July, which he applies to Mr. Clay's "War, pestilence and famine" Speech, so very germain to the present subject, that we cannot resist the desire of extracting it:

"Frightful pictures may be conjured up as bugaboos to alarm children: but they are truly contemptible when brought to operate on a great nation. Thirty years ago the same spirit raged—the Republican party were reviled as being actuated by the Jacobinical spirit of France—no abuse was too outrageous, no epithets too vulgar or severe to apply to them. The advocates of the elder Adams not only predicted the destruction of the government, by the election of Mr. Jefferson, but even the christian religion was to be prostrated before the moloch of Democracy. Such is the clamor, the hue and cry of all men in power, when the sceptre is about to pass from their hands—such is the course of all administrations, who have lost the confidence of the people, and such it will ever be. But freemen will disregard it—they have seen the folly and weakness of such unworthy attempts to influence public opinion—they have seen their important efforts—they have once snatched the constitution from usurpation—they will do it again, and find the country as much benefited by putting an end to the administration of the one, as the other Adams."

From the Boston Statesman.

MR. JOHN LOWELL.

This veteran politician of the Essex Junto school, and Hartford Convention Stamp, has it seems after four or five years, been able to make his appearance once more in the political cock-pit, clap his wings, and show fight. His last "demonstration" in political warfare, as John Q. Adams says, gave him little to be proud of, for his attack upon the Boston Patriot, was repulsed with such spirit and ability by its editor Col. Jarvis, that the "Rebel" has not been since in fighting trim. I am glad that he has come out against the Statesman, for I like the paper, and its republican principles, and nothing can be of so much service to it, as the opposition, and hostility of such paltt claus as JOHN LOWELL.

Mr. Lowell denies that he was the author of "the celebrated Essays in the Boston Centinel, in favor of the dissolution of the union." He admits however, that the charge is not one invented by the Statesman, that they have often been imputed to him, and that it has "never been contradicted" by him. When these Essays were written, they had a high reputation both in OLD ENGLAND and NEW ENGLAND. Mr. Lowell had *the credit of them*, and had the plans of the federal party succeeded, had the New England states obtained a release from the iron rule of democracy, and been brought back under the mild yoke of the British monarchy, he would have been thought worthy *of a peerage*, as a reward for those essays and his political writings. It is a little singular that Mr. L. should have been willing to be praised so long for writings, *which he never wrote*. Mr. Lowell says that he "condemned and regretted" the publication of those essays. He also assigns as a reason why he "never contradicted" the report that he was their author, that he felt "an entire indifference to it." How do these two things chime? Could Mr L. have "felt an entire indifference" to what he "condemned and regretted"? If he felt such an "entire indifference" about these essays "*in favor of the dissolution of the union*," his condemnation could not have been *loud*, nor his regret *deep*.

Mr. Lowell tells us that he "*openly* condemned and regretted" their publication. He does not say that he "openly condemned and regretted" their publication on account of their dangerous doctrines, but on account of the advantage they gave to the opponents of the federal party. But I challenge Mr. Lowell to furnish any satisfactory proof that he "*openly* condemned" those Essays, or any of the violent feelings and measures of the federal party of New England, during the late war. I know as well as Mr. Lowell does, all the *public* conduct of the federal leaders, and I throw the challenge in his teeth, to produce a *public* speech, vote or act, of his, in opposition to the course of conduct pursued by the Hartford Convention federalists, and which the late lamented Governor Eustis, so truly and boldly denounced in his able inaugural speech, responded to by the answer of the House of Representatives, and by which the atrocious conduct of the federal party, was put upon an enduring record, to be handed down to posterity, for their *eternal abhorrence*. It is a fact known to the whole country that John Lowell's influence *at that time*, with the federal party was so great, that—to say nothing of his open condemnation—a word, a sign, a look of disapprobation, from him, would have prevented those measures, which all *now* disown, and all *now* are obliged to condemn, and which sunk, as with a mill-stone about their necks, the Hartford Convention party, in the depths of a sea of infamy. Did John Lowell, on the day that he was joining in the Te Deum at the *King's* Chapel, [on that day resuming its old name] openly condemn the hoisting of the five striped flag—the Royal salute at noon—the New England salute of five guns at sun-set, by the Silver Grey heroes of Newburyport, where they threatened to "resist even unto blood"? Did John Lowell

openly condemn, and regret the Te Deum *which he assisted in getting up* in honor of the victories of England, our enemy, then desolating our country, and the Holy Alliance, the avowed enemies of all republican governments? Did John Lowell openly regret and condemn the conduct of Governor Caleb Strong, when he unlawfully refused, being sustained by his federal Judges, the call of the General Government for the Militia? Did John Lowell openly condemn and regret Strong's infamous proclamation, declaring our enemy England, the modern Babylon, "full of her abominations," who drove our fathers over the wide sea into the wilderness, to seek for the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty—THE BULWARK OF THE RELIGION WE PROFESS? Did John Lowell openly condemn and regret the resolution of Josiah Quincy, since expunged as a disgrace to the records of the Senate of Massachusetts, that it was unbecoming a moral and religious people to rejoice in the victories of their countrymen? Did John Lowell openly condemn James Lloyd's letter to John Randolph of Roanoke, insisting that President Madison should be "*compelled to resign*"? Finally—did John Lowell openly condemn that execrable measure to barter off its "innocent ribbands" for our Yankee Nobility, the "common people" of New England, as slaves to the British Crown—the HARTFORD CONVENTION? We appeal to the whole country to say whether John Lowell "openly condemned," or "openly" *countenanced*, the noted measures of the federal party of New England, during the war. The whole tendency of Mr. Lowell's writings and conduct was to sustain the federal party, and the whole aim and tendency of the measures of that party were to produce "A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION." To deny the abominable object of the Hartford Convention is now *useless*. The sentence of time has passed upon it, which is irreversible.

Mr. Lowell boasts of his zeal and exertions in the federal cause, and he is still proud of his federalism. We wish that his nephew, in whose behalf Mr. Lowell has stepped forth so gallantly, and the other amalgamation gentlemen, would be so frank! Mr. Webster, who has taken the helm of the federal party, from the Lowells, the Otises, &c. is the head of the amalgamation party in which Mr. Lowell's nephew holds a subordinate station. Now the amalgamationists have abjured the *name* but not the *principles* of federalism, and they are so *ashamed* of what Mr. Lowell seems to be so *proud of*, that they protest that federalism is dead, and the *state represented insolvent*. Mr. Lowell, who conceives that the federal party is living, that he is proud to belong to it, and Mr. Webster and his *underlings* who say that it is dead and buried, may settle this matter between them.

Mr. Lowell, also, in the transport of his admiration for federalism, loves it more when its supporters are out of power, than when in power. In this taste, the people of the United S. agree with him, and probably it is the only political matter in which they and Mr. Lowell can agree. The great mass of the people of the United States love the federal party best when out of power, for then they cannot oppress or do mischief. In order, too, that their love for the federalists may not be abated, they mean always to keep them out of power. As Mr. Lowell loves them best when in trouble, he will love them better than ever—after the next 4th of March.

Mr. Lowell also tells us how independent he is of the people, and how little he regards popular favour. This is the cant of all rundown politicians. It was only when the grapes were beyond his reach that the fox called them sour.

Mr. Lowell asserts his devotion to our government, and in the same breath boasts of his prompt, and constant exertions in the glorious cause of federalism. This seems to be a little inconsistent, for it a well known fact—that the great object of the federal party, has ever been the establishment of a Monarchical form of government, on the ruins of the Republic. Their zeal for the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, was merely because they saw it in the *form*, and hoped soon to see the *substance*, of that "most stupendous fabric of human invention" as the FIRST ADAMS called the BRITISH CONSTITUTION. They intended that we should soon have the *substance* of the British Constitution. The obnoxious measures of John Adams's administration, were all with this view. Had he been re-elected, God be thanked he was not, it was intended by Gag laws, the Bank influence, and a standing army, to force upon the people of the United States a KINGLY GOVERNMENT. When by the civil revolution of 1801, the plan was defeated, the next plan was *a dissolution of the Union*, and a Northern confederacy, under the protection of the British Crown, and under the government of a British Prince. This was the "*daring plot to dissever the Union*" of which Mr. Jefferson says "*the Hartford Convention was a subsequent Chapter.*" This plot and "*the treasonable designs of the federal party of that day*" were disclosed by John Q. Adams, who impeached his old associates, as is proved by the letters of Governor Giles and Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. Lowell says, as I have already observed, that he has never contradicted the story of his being the author of those Essays, and that he has felt "an entire indifference to it." Does this look as though he "*openly condemned and regretted*" those Essays, or does it look like assent and approbation? It is too late in the day for the leaders of the Federal party of New England in 1814 to hope to throw of the load of reproach which rests upon them. The very attempt only makes them *despised* by those who before only *hated* them. The people have set a mark upon them, and they will never *trust* them, nor *believe them*. Mr. Lowell has told us what he *has not* written. A man who is so proud of what he has done for the federal cause, can surely have no objection to informing the public what he *has* written during the last war, whether he is not the author of the "Road to Ruin," "the Boston rebel," and many essays in the Boston papers against Samuel Dexter when a candidate for Governor, on account of his opposition to the conduct of the Hartford Convention party.

Mr. Lowell assigns as a reason for coming out against the Statesman, that it was not on his account, but on account of his nephew. The best service which Mr. L. can render his relations in the political world, is to provoke no examination of *his* past political conduct, and to maintain a *discreet silence* on the subject of his connexions; besides Mr. Lowell's nephew will

never be of so much importance, as to provoke an attack sufficiently serious as to require in his defence such an able champion as Mr. John Lowell.

Mr. Lowell speaks with no small degree of complacency of the services which he is constantly rendering the public. He probably means as an agriculturalist, and I concede to him great merit in this particular. I have no doubt that in consequence of his exertions, our bulls at the Cattle Shows make a far more magnificent appearance than formerly, and that our pumpkins have greatly improved in size and flavor. Had Mr Lowell been as good a politician as he is a farmer, and had not sowed more *tares* than *wheat* in the political field, he would have enjoyed more of what he now seems to despise, popular favor, than has fallen to his lot. In that event he probably could have set a higher value upon it.

In parting with Mr. Lowell, I must repeat my introductory congratulation, on finding him, by the aid of Judge Marshall's *strengthening plaster*, for which Mr. Lowell sent all the way to Richmond, Va., so much recovered from the bruises which he received from Col. Jarvis. I hope he will recommend the use of this plaster to Mr. John Adams, a "*fellow sufferer*," in the *same cause*, by the *same hand*. XENOPHEN.

CIRCULAR ADDRESS

Of the Republican Committee of Correspondence for Pennsylvania.

Fellow Citizens:—

The convention of delegates, from the various counties of Pennsylvania, which assembled at Harrisburg, on the 8th of January last, and, in obedience to the will of their republican constituents, recommended Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun, as candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency of the United States, did us the honor to appoint us a committee of correspondence, for the second congressional district of this state,—the city of Philadelphia.

We are not aware, that it was the desire of the convention to limit the sphere of our action, or that we deviate from our proper course, in thus addressing our friends in other states; but, if we err, an apology, we are sure, will be found in the zeal, which animates our hearts in a righteous cause, that of the purity of our institutions, and their transmission unimpaired to posterity.

At the present crisis, indeed, the agency of committees of correspondence seems to be indispensably necessary, to the dissemination of truth: formerly, much reliance could be placed upon the ordinary organs of information; few, if any, of the conductors of the public journals, had the audacity to utter, for effect abroad, what was known at home to be absolutely untrue, but, during the existing contest, the adherents of the administration seem to consider the misrepresentation of our condition at home, as the principle foundation of anticipated success in other states; and hence it is, that even Pennsylvania has been classed among states faithless to themselves and to the union.

It seems, therefore, to be the duty of some of those, who have a stake in the duration of our institutions and the general welfare of society, to give their own testimony to distant friends; to scatter the mists of deception, in relation to Pennsylvania, which are hovering over other States, and to ask, in return, as we now respectfully do, from you, such information, as it may be supposed Pennsylvania must be anxious to receive.

With an earnestness, such as men should feel, who respect themselves, and covet the regard of others, we assure you, that the fidelity of Pennsylvania to the incorruptible patriot, whom she, first of all the States, had the honor to propose for the presidency, remains unshaken, that she glories in the position, which she held and holds; and that this spirit will be manifested by a majority, which, we believe, will be greater than that which any individual has ever had, at a contested election in Pennsylvania.

It is true, that, especially in the district in which we reside, demonstrations have of late been made, calculated, as they were designed, to create an impression abroad, that there had been a change in public opinion: but those exhibitions have been altogether scenic and factitious; our immediate opponents rest upon no common basis, nor are they connected by any common tie, so far as political principles are concerned; they embrace the aristocracy of the federal and republican parties of this district, but they want the honest, however erroneous, consistency of the former, and are utterly destitute of the great and guiding principles of the latter; with the people of the State at large, they have not the smallest sympathy, while amongst themselves they comprehend the most discordant and severally repulsive elements. Of the preponderance of their hopes or fears, you may form an estimate, from the grossness of their invective, and the intemperance of their proscription; they affect to respect the right of opinion, and yet denounce the mass of those disagree with them as a faction; they labour to affix upon the friends of Andrew Jackson the reproach of violence, yet they are sensible that their own associates and favorites are the only persons, who have sought to quench their political resentments with human blood; they feelingly speak of the odiousness of calumny, although their own partizans have violated the sanctuary of the domestic health, and have broken the silence of the tomb itself, to gratify their insatiable lust of defamation.

Such combinations, the people of Pennsylvania can never fear; such means, they ever will abhor; and, accordingly, we are insensible of any diminution of our strength: on the contrary, we confidently hope, that in this, the most aristocratic district in the State, we shall triumph at the ensuing election.

May we not, indeed, without incurring the penalty of self-praise, appeal to the uniform character and conduct of republican Pennsylvania, as a refutation of the slander, that she is capable of deserting her old principles and friends? She has not had the honor to offer to the Union, a Washington or Jefferson, Clinton or Jackson; but she has given to those distinguished patriots her cordial support: she has never been seen, contending in the arena of state ambition, but has clung with fondness to the union, as the sure basis of safety at home and reputation abroad. Why, then, should Pennsylvania be supposed capable of apostacy? Surely, she is not tempted by the knowledge, that, by a double co-

tract, between hitherto hostile partisans, and respectfully reviled aspirants, the people have been filched of their rights, which were purchased by the blood of their fathers! Surely she is not allured by a standard, which rallies around it all those persons, who have been at all times anxious to abridge human liberty, and to erect upon its ruins the fabric of privileged classes!

No! Pennsylvania is faithful; her deepest anxiety now is, that her sister states should truly understand, as she persuades herself she does, the nature of the pending contest; that it is not a mere controversy about men, but a mighty struggle for principles; that the success of one candidate would proclaim the supremacy of corruption, and the rapidity of the republic's decline; whilst the success of the other would redeem the fame of a free government, and transmit, unimpaired, to our immediate successors, the great legacy held for them and their posterity.

We fondly fancy, that we hear Pennsylvania applauded, by her sister states, for the steadiness with which she resists the current of official influence, which rolls impetuously through the state; but proud as she may be of the approbation of others, she seeks no such tribute: she well knows, that the inestimable blessings of freedom, as they were the reward of toil and vigilance, are not to be preserved without the constant exercise of those duties: she is not dismayed at the ambition and avarice, which produced the present crisis, for she knows that those evils were foreseen by the founders of the Republic, and are incident to the imperfection of human beings; and she is sensible that, as in all other free States, the pending conflict is between the aspiring few, who seek to pervert power to their own selfish purposes, and the mass of our freemen contending for its exercise for the common good.

It is under such impressions as these, be assured, that Pennsylvania acts, and therefore we cannot err in the anticipation, which will soon be gloriously realized: this state will maintain the only distinction to which she has ever aspired, that of being true to those principles, upon an adherence to which, under Heaven, our national safety and individual happiness depend.'

We greet you, not only on the view thus presented of Pennsylvania, but upon the indications of triumph manifested in other States; that we may receive of any intelligence equally cheering from your own neighborhood, we fondly hope: Addressed to our chairman, Joseph Worrel, Esq., it will be gladly received by

Your sincere friends—

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT.

Com. of Correspond.

Philadelphia, July 17th, 1828.

From the Buffalo Republican.

Mr. Adams and the Federalists.—The subject of the pledge made by Mr. Adams to the federalists, in a letter that was revised, corrected or modified by him, in his own hand writing, and by which he stipulated, in the event of his election, not to "pursue the policy of excluding the federalists from office," has been heretofore so often alluded to in this paper, that we perhaps owe an apology to our readers for troubling them further in relation to it. It has been publicly alleged in these columns, that amongst others to whom this letter was shown, was the late Mr. Richard Stockton, of this State, and an extract of a letter from that gentleman, relating thereto, has been laid before our readers. This charge, we are fully aware, is a very serious one and failing to show reasonable grounds to substantiate which, we frankly admit, that we should forfeit the confidence of our party and of the public. There is not an individual in the wide bounds of our republic, of correct and manly sentiments, who would not reprobate the conduct of the candidate for the presidency, who could stoop himself to make such a bargain as well as that of the wretch who could causelessly lay such a sin to his charge. But the charge has been made publicly; it has been reiterated from Maine, to Georgia; and yet the several persons referred to as being cognizant of the facts, have remained silent. Mr. Walsh, indeed, has given an exposition of the matter, which goes very far towards substantiating all that has been alleged. He denies the truth of the Stockton letter, it is true, and in one little month afterwards he admits the truth of every material allegation contained in that letter. His version does not at all release Mr. Adams from the charge made against him; on the contrary, it confirms the existence of the letter, concerning which he authorized Mr. King to give the most unequivocal denial, when the charge was first made. The letter remains uncontradicted except by the simple belief of Mr. R. F. Stockton, and is supported by the evidence of numerous individuals in this city [Trenton] and in other parts of the State. Among others who are cognizant of the facts stated in that letter, we call upon Mr. Webster, Mr. Southard, Messrs. Hopkinson and Walsh of Philadelphia, Mr. Stockton of the navy, Mr. Thompson, the son-in-law of the late Mr. Stockton, Mr. Bispham of Trenton, Mr. Armstrong of Woodburry, each and every one of them, to say whether they are not substantially true. The disputed letter was addressed to one of the gentlemen named, and if we are not misinformed, it has been seen by two others. We defy them to a contradiction, and the termination of the controversy shall be the production of the letter in question. We are not to be trifled with: nor will we keep our readers longer in suspense. Another word of abuse and contradiction, and we will "a round unvarnished tale deliver," which it will not be less pleasant for the coalition to hear, than it will be for us to be compelled to relate.

Nothing will satisfy the public, but the production of "the famous Webster letter." Bargaining and tampering in relation to the presidency, are charges that rests upon Messrs. Adams and Webster, and as yet they are uncontradicted. We do not despair of yet bringing this letter to light. A copy of it we have once seen and handled, and our readers may ere long expect to have it spread before them

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH....*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published, weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, AUGUST 9, 1828. No. 22.

THE MARYLAND ADDRESS.

The talented and patriotic writer of the Maryland Address, at the instance of the Corresponding Committee, has revised that able production, and appended to it much additional matter which the late developements of the bar gain have brought to light. We invite for it an attentive perusal—particularly of that part which examines the dangerous tendency of an election of President by the House of Representatives, and the duty which devolves upon the representatives of States under the Constitution as it now is.

It is a remarkable feature of the present controversy, that while the friends of Gen Jackson, like our fathers of the revolution, contend for great principles identified with civil liberty, the advocates of Messrs. Adams and Clay adhere to power, like the tories of that day.

ADDRESS

OF THE

JACKSON STATE CONVENTION

TO THE

PEOPLE OF MARYLAND,

On the late and approaching election of President.

(SECOND EDITION.)

Fellow Citizens: Having been appointed Delegates from the several Electoral Districts of the State, to meet in Convention, in this city, for the purpose of considering the course, which duty to our country enjoins upon us, in relation to the next election of President, we beg leave to lay before you the result of our deliberations.

After taking into our most serious consideration all the circumstances of the last Presidential election, we are, on mature reflection, impressed with a solemn conviction, that although the forms of the constitution were observed, the spirit of that sacred instrument was violated:—

That the Chief Magistrate was elected by the votes of the Representatives of States, against the will of the people of those States.

That if the votes of those States had been given according to that will, when the real contest day between Gen. Jackson and Mr. Adams, as the spirit of the constitution dictates, the former would have been elected President of the United States, instead of the latter.

That, therefore, the will of a *majority* of the *States*, as well as of the *people* of the Union has been defeated.

That the President, having thus obtained the Chief Magistracy, rewarded his principal assistant in defeating the voice of the nation, by the highest office in his gift, and has since employed the patronage of government, for the furtherance of his personal views, and to secure his re-election.

That before his election by the House of Representatives, Mr. Adams approved of an amendment of the constitution, in order to take the power of choosing the President from that body, and to give it directly to the people, for the purpose of preventing in future, not only all corruption, but all suspicion of corruption.

But that, since his success with the House of Representatives, in defeating the will of a *majority* of the *people* and of the *States*, he has not only disappointed the friends of the purity of our government, by declining to recommend that amendment to the adoption of Congress, but his friends in that body, when it was brought forward without his recommendation, *opposed* and *defeated* it.

In support of these opinions, we will state the facts, which have wrought conviction on our minds.

In the late Presidential election, *ninety-nine* electoral votes were given to General Jackson; *eighty-four* to Mr Adams, *forty-one* to Mr. Crawford, and *thirty-seven* to Mr. Clay.

Had the election been sent back to the people, and the choice restricted to the two highest candidates, as it virtually was in the House, there is no one, who was well acquainted with the state of public opinion in the Southern and Western States, where nearly all the votes for Mr. Crawford and Mr Clay were given, who would not be obliged to acknowledge, that of the seventy-eight votes received by those gentlemen, at least thirty-two, the number which, in addition to the ninety-nine already received by Gen. Jackson, was necessary to his election, would have been given to him. According to this test, therefore, a majority of the people of the United States, were opposed to the election of Mr. Adams. (*a*)

A majority of the states, if their wishes had been complied with, are also opposed to his election. He succeeded in the House by a majority of one state only; and it is notorious, that in contempt of the will of their constituents, who had given unequivocal proofs of their preference of General JACKSON over Mr. ADAMS, the representatives in Congress of several of the western states, gave their votes for Mr. ADAMS. *b.*

In political intrigues, written instruments are not exchanged, nor witnesses called in by the parties to attest the conditions of their compact. *Positive testimony* on the *present occasion*, is not therefore to be expected. *Circumstantial evidence* however, often as irresistible as *positive testimony*, has established beyond a reasonable doubt, that the votes thus given to Mr. ADAMS by Representatives in contempt of the will of their constituents, were obtained for him chiefly through the instrumentality and influence of Mr. CLAY. In proof of this fact, we solicit your attentive consideration of the following circumstances:

During the contest for electors, Mr. CLAY and his friends had opposed Mr. ADAMS more violently than any of the other candidates. (2) The grounds of objection to Mr. ADAMS, most warmly urged, were:

That a President ought to be elected from the West

That Mr. ADAMS was unfriendly to *Western* interests.

That he had attempted to sacrifice them in favor of his *Eastern* Brethren in the negotiation at Ghent.

Mr. CLAY himself charged Mr. ADAMS in his representation of that negotiation, with "errors both as to matters of fact and matters of opinion relating to the navigation of the Mississippi, and certain liberties, claimed by the United States in the fisheries"—and in allusion to the excitement of the pending presidential contest, stated that "at some time more propitious than the present, to calm and dispassionate consideration, and when there could be no misinterpretation of motives, he would lay before the public a narrative of those transactions." *c.*

In the circular address of Mr. CLAY's friends in Ohio, it is stated, that "it was the first object of the friends of Mr. CLAY, to keep from the Presidential Chair, *one of the present Cabinet*," and to elect some person, who was *out of the Cabinet*." The doctrine, that it was necessary to break up the "*succession Secretaries*" to the Presidency, or the "*Secretary dynasty*," so called, was urged throughout the West by Mr. CLAY's friends. *d.*

At length the contest for electors is over. Mr. CLAY is not returned to the House of Representatives, and could not himself therefore any longer be voted for.

Another *Western* man however, of great talents, splendid service and unquestioned integrity: and a man moreover, who did not belong to the *Cabinet*, was returned to the House, by a larger number of electors than Mr. ADAMS, and under circumstances, that left no reasonable doubt, as has already been shown, that when the real contest lay between him and Mr. ADAMS, he was the choice of a large majority of the people of the United States.

The elevation of General JACKSON, however to the Presidency, by satisfying the claim of the *West*, would operate against the future prospects of Mr. CLAY, which on the contrary, would be strengthened by the election of an *Eastern* man, especially if it could be seen by the *East*, that the boon was conferred upon them by his exertions and influence.

Mr. CLAY therefore, and his partisans with him, suddenly adopt a new set of opinions to suit altered circumstances, and think it in conformity with "SAFE PRECEDENTS" that another *Secretary* should be elected President:

That an *Eastern* man, whom they had denounced as unfriendly to *Western* interests, was nevertheless to be preferred to a *Western* man—and notwithstanding their late violent and bitter animosity and opposition, and in defiance of the known wishes of their constituents, vote for JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, and make him President of the United States.

As soon as Mr. ADAMS is thus made President by the vote and influence of Mr. CLAY, he rewards Mr. CLAY for his services with the highest office in his gift, makes him Secretary of State, and places him in the line of "*safe precedents.*"

Mr. CLAY gives his warmest support to Mr. ADAMS' administration, and forgetting his public pledge, is as silent as the grave about the Ghent negociation!

Can you, FELLOW CITIZENS, have stronger proof of a POLITICAL BARGAIN, by which the *rights of the People have been set at naught*, and *personal interests have triumphed over the spirit of the Constitution* and the *fundamental principles of republican government?* 3

Power, thus obtained by "influence and intrigue, bargain and management," with the unfaithful agents of the people against the will of the people, must of necessity be maintained and continued by the same means. *Hence* all the selfish passions of political opponents have been appealed to, and high offices have been lavished upon those who were most conspicuous amongst them, to purchase their support and neutralize the efforts of their friends.

Hence the papers under the immediate control of the government, have teemed with calumnies without number upon the distinguished and patriotic men, who have had the courage to stem the torrent of executive influence, to exercise and maintain the freedom of speech, and opinion, and to aid in an attempt to punish the violation of the spirit of the constitution.

Hence Mr. CLAY has attempted to punish the independence of other papers, by withdrawing the publication of the laws from them, because they were not entirely subservient to his views, and by transferring it to those of comparatively limited circulation, although the object of that publication is to diffuse a knowledge of the laws as widely as possible, amongst the people.

Hence, the papers which supported the election of Mr. ADAMS most warmly before the people, while it could serve the interest of their patron, recommended and applauded the proposition to change the mode of choosing the President, so as to take the contingent power of electing him from the House of Representatives, and give the election directly to the people, and assured the people that Mr. ADAMS, if elected, would use his influence in favor of the change, have, since his rejection by the people, and his election by the House of Representatives, thrown obstacles in the way of that proposition *e*

Hence, although Mr. ADAMS himself immediately after his election, while the obligation of former declarations and the assertions of his advocates and friends, were fresh upon his mind, in his answer to the committee of the House of Representatives, that waited upon him to inform him of his election, avowed his approbation of the proposed change in the following words:—"Could my refusal to accept of the Presidency, give an immediate opportunity to the people to form and express, with a nearer approach to unanimity, the object of their preference, I should not hesitate to decline the acceptance of that eminent charge and submit the decision of this momentous question again to their determination," and by assigning as his only reason for not doing so, that "constitution itself had not so disposed of the contingency, which would arise in the event of his refusal," offered a pledge of his support to a proposition so to change the Constitution in respect to the forms of the Presidential election as to take it from the House, and give it directly to the people; yet, notwithstanding this pledge and the general obligation of duty, imposed by the Constitution itself, to recommend to Congress such measures as he may deem the public welfare to require, he has hitherto declined sending a mes-

sage to Congress to recommend that change. On the contrary, when a measure for that purpose was introduced into Congress without the aid of his expected recommendation, nearly all his friends in that body arrayed themselves against it, and all his *New England* friends without a single exception, voted against taking the election from the House of Representatives. *f*

The foregoing statement demonstrates that Mr. Adams, having obtained power by violating the spirit of the Constitution, is employing all the means, which his situation gives him, to maintain it and to secure a re-election, and gives us the solemn admonition that the period has arrived in the operation of our government, when it behoves the People to recur to first principles, and to enquire if the foundation on which their *political liberty* rests *be not undermined*.

The *fundamental principle* on which our whole system rests, is the political equality of the citizens.

From this political equality, necessarily results the doctrine, that the *will of the majority shall prevail*.

The object of all the forms of our National and State Governments is to secure the fair and unbiased expression of that will.

The only effectual security against the abuses of the Supreme Executive Power, is the *direct responsibility* of him, who exercises it, to the *people* over whom it is exercised; and the only efficient mode, by which that responsibility can be enforced, is by *making the Chief Magistrate dependant upon the People for the possession and the continuance of his power*.

We hold it to be undeniable, that according to the theory of our constitution, the election of the President of the United States, was intended to be *the act of the American people*, and that *the electors are bound to vote according to the will of their constituents*.

We also hold, that when the election of the President devolves upon Congress, the representatives of the several States, in the discharge of their *electoral* duty, are by the spirit of the constitution, which they are sworn to support, bound, like the electors *to carry into effect*, so far as practicable, *the will of their constituents*.

And we are of opinion, after the most dispassionate and deliberate consideration of all the circumstances, attending the late presidential election, that the foregoing fundamental principles were violated in the election of John Quincy Adams to the Chief Magistracy by the House of Representatives, in which the votes of several States were given by representatives, contrary to the known will of the people of those States. Such, fellow citizens, are the essential and fundamental principles of liberty in our government, according to our construction of the constitution. Such are the great principles which have been violated.

The supporters of Mr. Adams endeavour to avoid the odium of that violation by giving a totally different interpretation of the constitution. They justify the conduct of those, who voted against the will of their constituents, by maintaining the alarming doctrine, that the members of the House of Representatives in the election of president, may throw off all reference and regard to the opinions of the people and the states, and under the plea of "*interrogating their consciences*," set up their own judgment and wishes, generally the offspring of their interest, in opposition to the disinterested wishes and will of their constituents. *g*

This doctrine is maintained in the face of the very words of the constitution, which directs that when the election of President devolves on the House of Representatives, the vote shall be taken by States, and the representation of each State shall be entitled to *one vote*, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice. The natural and plain construction of the terms *vote of a state*, means a *vote expressing the will of the people of the State*, and not the *personal vote* of the representatives from the state —It was intended to preserve, in the secondary election, the *federative* character of the General Government, by giving to *each State an equal weight and influence*, which object would be entirely defeated by giving the *representatives a personal discretionary vote*. This feature of the Constitution was inserted in imitation of the provisions of the old Confederation, according to which the vote was always taken by States, and it is well known, that the delegates in congress from the states under the Confederation were completely under the control and subject to the instructions of the Legislatures by which they were sent and by whom also they were recalled at pleasure.

The reasoning then, from the intention of the framers of the constitution, as well as from analogy is strongly in favor of the construction for which we contend.

And we beg every citizen who is attached to liberty and his country, to pause and reflect seriously upon the fatal consequences of giving the latitudinarian construction of the constitution contended for by the supporters of Mr. Adams. Adopt this construction and you throw wide open the door to corruption, and the election in the House will inevitably, to adopt the language of the circular address of Mr Clay's friends in Kentucky be determined, "*by influence and intrigue, bargain and management.*" *h*

General Jackson the last of the revolutionary heroes, who came in the course of nature, a candidate for the Presidency, and from the increase of population and the multiplication of the states, we must expect, after the next election, that so many candidates will be set up that the primary election will rarely be conclusive. It will become a matter of course for the election to devolve on the House of Representatives. —Their Hall, instead of being a seat of independent legislation, will become a theatre for electioneering and intrigue from the period of one election to another. The ambitious men, who aspire to the Presidency, will generally be members of congress or of the cabinet, and will have the opportunity of laying their plans deliberately and pursuing them perseveringly.— All the arts of personal address, of flattering attentions and entertainments will be resorted to. The sordid will hope for offices of profit for themselves or relations as a reward for attaching themselves to the cause of some one of these Presidential Candidates. The ambitious will look for promotion and distinction. Those, who desire no appointments for *themselves*, will hope to obtain an influence in the distribution of the patronage of the government, and have it in their power to gratify their *friends*. Self-love will often disguise, even from the parties them-

ılves, the true nature of the influence under hich they act, and a whole circle of interest- l motives, will have full scope for action under ıe appearance of a desire to serve friends, or romote the interest of their neighborhood, or erhaps the interest of the country at large.

Nor ought we from false delicacy to deny the ct, that high and respectable as the station of ember of Congress is, that occasionally men of ıe most venal and corrupt character attain it: ıd when we reflect that the whole number of otes is only twenty-four:—that the votes of one ; two individuals in consequence of divisions nongst the representatives of even large states, ill often decide the vote of those states: and ıat the votes of several small states are actual- beld by individual members:—when we re- ect further that this highest honor on earth will ten rest upon the decision of some *half* dozen even a less number of persons, perhaps *one* a body composed of more than two hundred embers, and place before us the fact, that the uccessful candidate will have the distribution of ealth and distinction, in the nomination to ten ousand various offices, we must tremble for ıe liberty of our country, unless we wilfully ut our eyes to all the records of history, all ıe lessons of experience, and all the deduc- ons of reason. 4

Let it not be said we dishonor our country by presenting Congress as liable to corruption. e have a just confidence in Congress. We elieve that the members are as virtuous and pat- otic as other men: we will admit, that their lucation, character, and stations in life place ıem as much above the reach of improper in- uence, as any equal number of their fellow- tizens—perhaps even more. It is not because ey are less virtuous than others, that we look them with distrust, when they come to exer- se the functions of electors of the Chief Mag- trate; but it is because they are men, and *men posed to the strongest and most seductive temp- tions disguised in the most alluring and delu- ve forms.* We should be traitors to truth and ow ourselves incapable of instruction from e whole history of our race, nay, insensible to e dictates of common sense, if we should from urious patriotism or any other motive, give ountenance to the idea, that Congress is so ure and disinterested, and so elevated in char- ter, that the small number of members gen- ally necessary to change the fate of the elec- on, may not be found, who are liable to be in- enced in the vote they are to give, by person- interest, not approaching them in the revol- ng shape of a direct bribe, but in the enticing rm of distinction amongst their fellow-citizens d reward for patriotic services.

So long then as the forms of the constitution relation to the election of President remain they are, the most disastrous consequences ill flow from the construction contended for the supporters of Mr. Adams. The most ittering prize, that ambition can seek, with l its accompanying allurements, is every four ars to be thrown into the midst of two hund- d fallible men to distract and excite them- en too, who are cut loose from the wholesome straints of a safe construction of the constitu- n, which furnishes a sure and certain guide their conduct. in the will of their constitu- ts.

A decision under such circumstances will rarely if ever inspire the nation with confidence in the President—*that confidence, which is so necessary to the independent and salutary exercise of the executive authority.*

Under this dangerous and anti-republican construction of the constitution a justification is attempted of the most flagrant violation of its spirit, and exhibits in the strongest point of view, a necessity for a change of *its forms*, which shall place its *principles* above all misconstruction. We earnestly entreat you, therefore, Fellow-Citizens, not to believe, as those, who have obtained power at the expense of your rights would persuade you to do, that the ensuing Presidential Election is a simple contest between two eminent citizens for the Chief Magistracy, in which their personal merits and past services are alone to be considered. Great as they may be esteemed by the friends of Gen. Jackson and Mr. Adams respectively, they are as dust in the balance, and dwindle into utter insignificance, when compared with the importance of the great constitutional principles, which are at stake. No conflict of parties since the commencement of our Government has involved such vital interests as are now in agitation. It is not a question whether a few cents more or less duty upon Woollen or Cotton Manufactures shall be imposed:—it is not a question, whether Internal Improvement shall be prosecuted under the authority of the General Government or abandoned as either inexpedient or unconstitutional:—it is not a question, whether Commissioners, or Ministers Plenipotentiary, or no agents at all shall be sent to Panama:—it is not a question, whether the trade with the British West Indies, (important as it is to our shipping and agricultural interest) has been lost by neglect or mismanagement. These questions, interesting as they are, are nevertheless of little consequence compared with those, which you are now called upon to decide, *involving as they do in the maintenance or surrender of the fundamental principles of the constitution, and the vital interests of liberty.*

The great questions now in agitation are; whether the Chief Maigstracy shall be obtained by "influence and intrigue, bargain and management," or be awarded to merit and public services by the unbought suffrages of the people:—whether the influence of Governmental patronage shall sustain a *minority* in power against the will of the *majority*:—whether the forms prescribed by the constitution, regulating the election of the Chief Magistrate, originally designed to give effect to the will of the majority, but which have been found inadequate to the purpose, shall be abolished, and the *election be given directly to the People*:—and whether the people themselves have spirit and intelligence enough to eject from power, those who have obtained it under the *forms* of the Constitution, in violation of its *spirit*, or whether they are prepared to submit without resistance to usurpation.

Those who are interested in maintaining existing abuses, and oppose that change which would put an end to them hereafter, seek to attract exclusive attention to the *measures* of the Administration, and to draw it off from the *violation of great and fundamental principles* in their elevation to power. While this violation

s with us the principal ground, upon which we oppose the re-election of Mr. Adams, we see nevertheless, strong reasons for opposition, in the manner in which he was exercised by far the most important of all the functions of the executive authority—*we mean the power of appointing to office and distributing the patronage of the Government. The* use, that has been made of this to buy up political opponents and control the freedom of the press, deserves and receives our unqualified reprobation.

The next most important branch of Executive duties relates to the regulation of our intercourse with foreign nations. The friends of the administration ascribe great diplomatic talents to the President, and yet on the most interesting subject of negotiation, which has occurred since his election, he has been guilty of a palpable neglect of duty, to which we do not think a parallel can be found in the history of our exterior retations, and to which we are indebted for the loss of one of the most important and profitable branches of our commerce—we mean our trade with the West Indies, so essential to the prosperity of Maryland and the other grain growing States, as well as to the shipping interest. Notwithstanding a minister was dispatched to England at great expense to the nation, all the necessary instructions were omitted to be given in relation to this trade, and no recommendation of legislative measures was sent to Congress to meet those of the British Parliament, the terms of which our Minister, now when it is too late, is instructed to comply with, and an attempt is made to cast the blame on Congress for not acting without Executive recommendation, although it was distinctly intimated to the chairman *(i)* of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate, and through him to that body, that the Administration preferred to arrange that part of our foreign trade by negotiation.

Another expedient resorted to by the supporters of Mr. Adams to divert attention from the manner of his obtaining power and to misrepresent the grounds of our opposition to his re-election, requires our notice.

The most strenuous efforts are made to excite prejudice against the friends of General Jackson by representing them as opposed to Internal Improvement and Domestic Manufactures: although it is well known that many of his warmest advocates are amongst the most decided supporters of those great interests, and the constitutional doctrines upon which their protection depends.

We utterly deny that these measures are the lines of separation between the supporters of Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson.

The friends of Mr. Adams differ with each other on these questions, so also do the friends of General Jackson, but are held firmly together by the common interest which we all feel in preserving the great and fundamental principles of the constitution, and while we are engaged in repairing the shattered timbers of the vessel of State to prevent it from sinking, we do not stop to dispute about the course she shall take, when the danger is over.

We say then, let the administration be judged by the principles and the means, by which they obtained their power.

Was it, think you, the heavy grievance of paying a duty of two pence per pound on tea, that induced our ancestors to resist Great Britain, to defy her power and brave all the hazard of the revolutionary war?—No, fellow-citizens, it was the principles upon which that measure was justified and adopted—it was the right claimed of controling us by law, made without our consent—in other words against the *will* of a *majority*—it was the principle of tyranny—it was the usurpation of power which our revolutionary fathers resisted: Had they stopped to weigh the measures of the British administration, and compare the grievance of the tax, with the burthens and perils of the war, without reference to a *principle*, the surrender of which was a virtual surrender of liberty, opposition would not have been made: our glorious revolution would not have been achieved, and an experiment of self government, which we are now making, and upon the success of which the hopes of freedom's friends, throughout the world depend, would never have been tried.

We would ask those who pass over without the remark, violation of the principles of the constitution, by which Adams ascended to power, and ask us to regard his acts only after obtaining it, what would they say, if taking possession of the President's House at Washington, he had claimed the executive authority in right of birth, his father having been President before? Would they then fold their arms and say, let us wait and see what use he makes of his power, and estimate him by the measures which he recommends? No! every voice, and every hand would be raised to put down the usurper, because the forms as well as the spirit of the constitution would have been violated. In the present case we admit as the forms of the constitution have been complied with, Mr. Adams must for the time be regarded as constitutionally invested with the executive authority, and it is the duty of every patriotic citizen in reference to those forms, "to sustain the wholesome operations of the government," and "support all the measures essential to the prosperity of the country," but it is equally his duty to proclaim from the house top, the violation of the principles of the constitution in the last Presidential election, and to exert every power under those forms to punish the men who have been guilty of it, by refusing to continue to them beyond the constitutional term, the power thus improperly attained. We believe it to be peculiarly proper, that atonement should be made to the violated constitution by the elevation to the chief magistracy, of Gen. Andrew Jackson, the patriot hero, through whom the constitution has been wounded. *His cause at the last election rested upon great* TALENTS, *exemplary* PATRIOTISM *unquestioned* INTEGRITY, *and splendid* SERVICES. *It has now become identified with the CAUSE of the CONSTITUTION, of LIBERTY, and the COUNTRY.*

The enemies of Andrew Jackson call him a "*Military Chieftain.*"—We reply: So was WASHINGTON, the FATHER of his *country.*

They say he has not been a *foreign Minister*—neither had WASHINGTON nor MADISON.

They say, there are no great *speeches* made by him in Congress on record, to attest his political talents; neither are there any of WASHINGTON, nor JEFFERSON Mr. ADAMS himself.

They would persuade you that Jackson has had no experience in *civil affairs*, because his most brilliant services have been of a *military* character: yet he rose to distinction as a lawyer at the bar of Tennessee, became her Attorney General—was a leading and most efficient member of the Convention that framed the Constitution—served as her first Representative in Congress—as a Judge of her Supreme Court; as Governor of Florida; as a member of the Senate of the United States at two different periods, and had had the offer of a foreign embassy: thus actually occupying six different civil offices during a period of twenty years, and only one military office, that of General, first in the militia of Tennessee, and afterwards in the United States Army.

His enemies say, however, that he resigned all his *civil* appointments; but they forget to tell you, it was usually at the call of his country to higher stations; and that he also resigned his *military* command, when the circumstances of the country did not render his services any longer indispensable, thereby showing that a desire to render real service, and not a love of emolument or official distinction, was his only motive for accepting or retaining office, civil or military. No one, however, has ever shown that he did not perform the duties of all the numerous offices he has filled, whether civil or military, with efficiency and zeal; nor has any one dared to call in question his eminent services, his devoted patriotism, his unspotted integrity; or to deny to him great elevation, decision, and firmness of character, a vigorous and powerful intellect, and clear and solid judgment, and *an extraordinary sagacity to discern and appreciate the character and zeal of others*; a talent, which we esteem the most essential of all the qualifications of the Chief Magistrate, whose most difficult and trying duty consists in the selection of men for office.

The friends of Gen Jackson have a double object in calling him a "*Military Chieftain*." The first is, to make the impression that he has no experience or reputation in *civil* affairs;—The second, that he is regardless of the Laws. This charge of violence has arisen from the many embarrassing situations in which he has been placed, where none but the most energetic measures of *seeming* violence, but *real* necessity, and cool deliberation could extricate his country from disaster and disgrace. But those who make this charge, omit to tell you of the magnanimous example of submission to the laws which he set immediately after the battle of New Orleans, when arraigned before a court of justice for a writ of *Habeas Corpus* during the existence of martial law. As the account of his demeanor on the occasion displays one of the noblest characteristics of the man, we will state it in the words of an eloquent "VINDICATOR" of his fame in the West:

"During the existence of Martial Law at N. Orleans, and whilst the British Army—all, a quadruple of ours, hovered within a few hours sail of the city, and whilst mutiny and dissatisfaction were making progress, Gen. Jackson arrested a man, who in his legislative character had before attempted to surrender the city to the British, and who continued to excite the American army to mutiny by an incendiary publication.

He was arrested by Jackson and refused to the order of Judge Hall, and the Judge himself dispatched to a place of safety at some distance from the city.

Had Gen. Jackson yielded to the mandate of Hall, his army must have been dissolved and within a day the streets of Orleans have been drenched with American blood. But when the danger was over, Gen. Jackson, immediately evinced "his respect for the laws," by yielding himself up to the civil authority, *to pay the penalty of having saved his country*. He was summoned before Judge Hall, was refused a trial by jury, and his counsel prevented from reading his defence. He had thrown off his military garb, with the hope of being undiscovered in the crowd, and prepared to the court to submit to whatever penalty his adversary might inflict. He had reached the bar unnoticed, when he was at length perceived, and with admiration beaming in every countenance, and gratitude speaking in every eye, the building echoed with rapturous shouts of applause of Jackson and menaces of the Judge: the Hero rose and addressed the assemblage. He told them of "the duty due to the public authorities," and "urged them, if they had a regard for him, that they would on the present occasion, forbear those feelings, and expressions of opinion." The terrified Judge was about to adjourn the court, when Jackson again rose and requested it might not be done, declaring, "*there is no danger here—there shall be none: the same arm that protected from danger this city, against the invaders of the country, will shield and protect this court or perish in the effort.*" The Judge then proceeded and fined him *one thousand dollars*. The enthusiasm of the people could be restrained no longer; hurrying him forcibly against his repeated entreaties, into a carriage, they bore him in triumph to a public room, still menacing the Judge. Order being at length restored, Gen. Jackson rose and addressed them with great feeling saying, "that if they had the least gratitude for his services, they would evince it in no way so satisfactorily, as by submitting, as he most cheerfully did to the decree, which had just been pronounced against him—*That the civil was the paramount and supreme authority—that submission to the civil authority is the first duty of the citizen.* Had the penalty reached my utmost ability to meet it, I should not have murmured or complained."*

He immediately paid the fine. The citizens of New Orleans collected however and placed the amount to his credit in bank and notified him of it. He refused it in a manner the most delicate. In his reply he declared he could not accept of it, yet as it was the result of the most generous feelings, he solicited, that the amount might be applied to the assistance and relief of those, whose relations, during the siege, had fallen in battle; the proposition was acceded to and the amount subscribed, which had been designed expressly for his relief, was disposed of for the benefit of the WIDOWS and FATHERLESS."

In the above relation, behold the genuine character of the "*Military Chieftain*," who is represented as despising the authority of the Laws and Constitution of his country. Let us then rally round this Heroic Citizen. Let us reward his valour, his patriotism, his magnanimity and toilsome services by the highest honor a

grateful people can bestow; assured that *his success is associated with the triumph of the* CONSTITUTION, of LIBERTY and the cause of our beloved COUNTRY.

APPENDIX.

a Mr. Adams, at the last election in the House of Representatives, received the votes of five of the western States. In the nine western States General Jackson received twenty-nine electoral votes, and Mr. Adams only three; but one of which was from the people, whereas twenty-six of the Jackson electors were chosen immediately by the people themselves. The returns of the *popular* votes in the eight western states, as contained in the papers printed at the time, and not contradicted, are as follows, viz:—

	Jackson.	*Adams.*	*Clay.*	*Crawford.*
Ohio,	18489	12280	19255	
Kentucky,	6453		16782	
Alabama,	9443	2417	67	1680
Indiana,	7343	3095	5315	
Tennessee,	20197	216		312
Mississippi,	3254	1694		119
Illinois,	1901	1542	1047	219
Missouri,	987	311	1401	
Total,	68067	21555	43867	2330

From the above returns it appears, that of the votes of the people in eight western States, General Jackson received 46,512 votes more than Mr. Adams—24,201 more than Mr. Clay—2,645 more than Mr. Clay and Adams together, and 315 more than the whole received by all three of the opposing candidates. Suppose the contest to have laid between Mr. Adams and General Jackson, and the votes confined to those two, is there any one, who looks at the above statement of the actual votes received by Mr. Adams and reflects that Mr. Clay's friends had industriously represented Mr. Adams as unfriendly to *western* interests, and that a President ought not again to be taken from the *cabinet*, is there any one, we repeat, who will venture to say that Mr. Adams would have got one-fourth of the votes of the nine western States? And yet he received the votes of *five* States in Congress, and General Jackson only *four*.

The following are the results of the votes of such States, as are not contained in the above list, taken from the papers printed at the close of the Presidential election. They [illegible] far from the official returns.

	Jackson.	*Adams.*	*Crawford.*	
Maine,		6870	2[illegible]	
Massachusetts,		30687	6616	
Connecticut,		7587	1978	
Rhode Island,		2145	200	
New Hampshire,		4,107	643	
Virginia,	2,861	3,189	8,189	416
New Jersey,	10,985	9,110	2,196	
Pennsylvania,	36,100	5,440	4,206	1,690
N. Carolina,	20,415		15,621	
Maryland,	14,523	14,632	3646	695
	84,884	83,767	44,975	[illegible]
Add Western States	68,067	21,557	2,330	43,867
Total U. S.	152,951	105,322	47,305	46,668

From this Table it appears, that General Jackson's majority of the popular vote so far as taken throughout the United States, over Mr. Adams, was 47,628, and over both Adams and Clay 961.

The return of votes from N. Hampshire, Virginia and Missouri in the above tables are not entirely complete, the votes from some few counties not being included.—These however, could not vary the result 1000 votes, and supposing that thousand be taken from General Jackson, there can be no question in the mind of any one who recalls the state of public opinion in the States Delaware, N. York, Vermont, Georgia, and South Carolina, where the electors were appointed by the legislatures, that if the vote of the people had been taken, there would have been for Jackson, a much larger majority than 1000 votes And if any one will recollect the state of public opinion in those southern and western States, where Clay and Crawford received the principal part of their votes, he cannot, without flying in the face of all reasonable calculations, come to any other conclusion, than that, if the election in those states had been by the people and the choice restricted to Jackson and Adams, the majority of the former over the latter, throughout the Union, would have been greatly increased. And if you look to the public opinion in the States where Crawford and Clay received the votes, you will be obliged to admit that if their choice in the house had been confined to Adams and Jackson the votes of nearly all of them would have been for Jackson, if the will of the people of these States had been attended to by their representatives in Congress.

b All the electoral votes for Mr. Adams were received from the New England States and New York, except seven, which were received as follows: one out of three from Delaware—three out of eleven in Maryland—two out of five in Louisiana one out of three in Illinois; that is only 7 electoral votes out of 17 states, and not a majority of the electoral votes in any one of those 17 states: yet in the House of Representatives he received the votes of 6 of these 17 States.

In confirmation of this view, the people of Kentucky at the last Congressional election, after Mr. Adams was chosen President, turned out those who had voted for him, and returned representatives, two-thirds of whom, are friendly to Gen. Jackson.

In Illinois, the majority of the people being in favor of Gen. Jackson, turned out Daniel P. Cook, who had voted against their will for Mr. Adams.

The same fate awaited Mr. Scott, who had violated the will of his constituents, and gave the vote of Missouri to Mr. Adams.

It is proved by the statement of O. B. Brown, Esq. that in a conversation with Mr. SCOTT, the latter in reply to the question, whether "his vote" (for Mr. Adams) "would be popular in Missouri," said, that *nineteen-twentieths of his constituents would be opposed to it:*" He added, that "it was ascertained, if Mr. ADAMS should not be elected on the first ballot, he could not be elected afterwards: that if he had not voted for Mr. Adams, Mr. COOK, of Illinois, would not have voted for him, and that without both their votes, he would not have been elected." It was

hen remarked, that, as the election had depended upon him, (Scott,) he (Brown) supposed, in case of his failure at the next election, he would be otherwise provided for. To this, he answered, that "he would accept of no appointment whatever under the administration of Mr. ADAMS, *lest it should be regarded as the reward of his vote.*" *The reward however of lucrative appointments were afterwards offered by Mr.* ADAMS, *both to Mr.* SCOTT *and Mr.* COOK, *and by both accepted*, as above stated.

(2) Since the first edition of this address, an examination of testimony on oath was instituted before the Senate of Kentucky, in consequence of the introduction into that body, by a member friendly to the present Administration, (Mr. BEATTY,) of a Resolution declaring, that "*the charges of bargain, sale and corruption in "the election of* JOHN Q. ADAMS, *are utterly false and malicious.*" In this examination a variety of most important facts, which establish the bargain beyond all reasonable doubt, were proved by witnesses of unimpeached and unimpeachable character, a number of whom were at the time members of the Kentucky Legislature. These facts will be referred to in subsequent notes. The object of this note is to shew the hostility existing between Mr. CLAY and Mr. ADAMS previous to the last Presidential election.

On an amendment of the above resolution, proposed by Mr. POPE, a gentleman, who married a sister of Mr. Adams' wife, which went to declare—"that the charges made against John Q. Adams, before the last Presidential election, in the western country, in the public prints and pamphlets, that he was hostile to the rights and interests of the west, and that he attempted, in the negotiation at Ghent, to sacrifice or prejudice the rights or interests of the western country, are utterly false, and were brought forward and circulated to destroy the confidence of the western people in the said John Q. Adams, and to promote the views of a rival candidate;" a debate took place in which Mr. DAVEISS, from Mercer County, rose and said—

"That he could not vote for the amendment offered by the honorable gentleman from Washington, as he had been taught to believe, from every thing he had seen in the public prints or otherwise, that Mr. Adams had long been an enemy to the West, and had attempted to cede away the navigation of the Mississippi to the British Government, at the treaty of Ghent.—These were the declarations of Mr. Clay and his friends anterior to the Presidential election (Mr. D. was here interrupted by Mr. Wickliffe, who denied the charge of Mr. Clay's having ever said any thing about Mr. Adams, and called upon the gentleman from Mercer, (Mr. Daveiss,) to furnish the House with some responsible witness to support the statement he had made.) Mr. Daveiss said that he had the evidence at hand. I will take the liberty of presenting to the House, certain numbers addressed to the people of Ohio under the signature of Wayne, which were published in the Cincinnatti Gazette, in the year 1822, and afterwards republished in the Argus of Western America. These numbers, said Mr. D., I now hold in my hand. (Mr. Wickliffe again interrupted Mr. Daveiss, by observing that he had called upon the gentleman for a responsible witness, whose name would be surrendered up.) Mr. Daveiss said that he hoped the gentleman would have patience; before he was done he would render the evidence complete. I state, continued Mr. D. upon the most unquestionable authority, that these numbers were written by a citizen of Kentucky, and the manuscript sent to Mr. Clay. How they afterwards made their appearance in the Cincinnatti Gazette, will be for Mr. Clay to account. I am now ready to prove the fact, if the gentleman from Fayette, (Mr. Wickliffe) requires it. The proof is now within the walls of this House. I pause to see if the friends of Mr. Clay will call for the proof * * * * * * "not daring to meet this proof, the friends of Mr. Clay, remained silent, when Mr. DAVEISS proceeded and said, "these numbers, particularly the third and fourth, present Mr. Adams in a most odious point of view to the people of the West, and had the effect to prostrate him, in that State, as well as Kentucky.

The extract from WAYNE then read, being two long for insertion at large in this note, the following expressions, which are sufficient to shew the nature of that publication, are quoted from it Mr. ADAMS is amongst many other things, charged with "*an unfeeling policy,*" which "*would crimson our fresh fields with the blood of our border brethren, and light the midnight forest with the flames of their dwellings;*" with "*giving our wives and children for fish, and bartering the blood of our citizens for money;*" with being "*ignorant*" of western interests, or "*disregarding*" them. The proposition made at Ghent, he declares to be a "*fatal project,*" an "*atrocious proposal,*" "*as strange as it is alarming,*" and that but for Mr. CLAY's exertions, "*the seeds of war might now have been sowing, along our northern and western borders, which, at no distant day, would have produced an abundant harvest of tears and blood.*" The publication concluded by saying, in allusion to the alleged hostility of Mr. Adams to the West, as demonstrated by the Ghent Negotiation. It shows the interest we have in placing a distinguished western man at the helm of the nation, and the justice of distributing to every section, its due share in foreign missions, as well as in the cabinet itself."

These publications, signed Wayne, and reviewed by Mr. CLAY before they were sent to the press may be seen at large in the *Cincinnatti* notice, where they first appeared, or in the paper where they were republished on the 14th and 18th November, 1822.

But the part which Mr. CLAY bore in the publication of these numbers is proven by his own letter. In an address to Mr. Clay, lately published, Mr. Kendall says:

"These numbers were sent to you at Lexington. The following extract of a letter from you, dated Lexington, 23d June, 1822, acknowledges the receipt of them, shows how they got to Cincinnati, and proves your agency in this attack upon Mr Adams:

"I received your obliging favor of the 20th inst. and thank you most sincerely for the friendly sentiments towards me which it contains. Mr. T. Crittenden has retained the production which accompanied it, and which he has undertaken to divide and to dispose of in

his place of residence, [Cincinnati,] *according to* OUR WISHES.'"

In the abovementioned investigation before the Senate of Kentucky, it was proved on oath, that, after the publication of Mr. ADAMS' book upon the Fisheries, Mr. CLAY called upon his friend, the Editor of the Argus of Western America, published at Frankfort, in Kentucky, gave him a narrative of the proceedings at Ghent, and explained the principles involved in them. The Editor then took up the publication of Mr. Adams, and reviewed it in a series of nine letters, addressed to JOHN QUINCY ADAMS. After most of these letters had been published in the Argus, Mr. CLAY conversed with the Editor "about publishing them in a pamphlet, and offered to pay $50 of the expense. This was declined. It was proved, however, by the oath of Mr. Tanner, a printer, that Mr. CLAY afterwards conversed with him as to the expense of printing the pamphlet. Mr. Tanner being asked, "whether he printed it?" he replied "that he did." And on being asked "whether Mr. CLAY paid any part of the expense?" he replied, "that he did pay *one hundred dollars*."

The full extent of the charges against Mr. ADAMS, contained in these letters, the materials for which had been originally furnished by Mr. CLAY, as was proved by the oath of the Editor of the Argus, in which they first appeared, can only be judged of after a perusal of the pamphlet itself, which was printed in the latter part of 1823. The following extracts, however, will sufficiently shew the nature and spirit of them. Mr. ADAMS is charged with "*bearing false witness against his neighbor;*" with "*falsehood*" in relation to the navigation of the Mississippi; with "*weighing dollars against blood;*" with "*falsehoods*" relative to the extent of the fisheries, contested at Ghent; with "*knowingly violating the very letter of his instructions;*" with pursuing "*a course wholly sectional;*" with attempting to "*make the Western people pay an exclusive tax of rivalship, war and blood, for the security of those fishermen, who frequent British waters;*" with "*manufacturing facts;*" with asserting "*opposite principles;*" with gross "*absurdities, inconsistencies, and contradictions,*" with injustice to his colleagues of the minority, with a policy promoting Indian wars and massacres; with "*a deadly hostility, or a culpable indifference, to the interests of the Western country;*" with hostility to the annexation of Louisiana to the United States; with insincerity in the defence of his votes, in relation to the West; with "*adding insult and mockery, to abandonment and injustice;*" with being "*an artful sophist, a clumsy negotiator, and vindictive man;*" with "*views too erroneous, feelings too sectional, and temper too vindictive, for the Chief Magistrate of a free people.*"

THOMAS P. MOORE, a member from Kentucky, who refused to vote against the will of the people of that State, to promote Mr. CLAY's views, though at that period one of his most ardent friends, in a letter to Gen. VAN NESS, after saying he was, before the Presidential election, "warmly attached to Mr. CLAY, and decidedly hostile to Mr. ADAMS," states, that he "had denounced him (Mr. ADAMS) in all parts of the district represented by him, *on the authority of facts, derived from Mr.* CLAY."

That Mr Adams was aware of the hostility of Mr. Clay, is perfectly manifest from the following extracts from his book upon the Fisheries and the Mississippi. In the first page of the introduction, Mr. Adams says:

"In the course of last summer, (of 1821,) I was apprized by a friend, that rumors very unfavorable to my reputation, even for integrity, were industriously circulated in the western country. That it was said I had made a proposition at Ghent to grant to the British the right to navigate the Mississippi, in return for the Newfoundland fisheries, and that this was represented as, at least, a high misdemeanor." "He said, the proposal was to be represented (as an offence) so that it was charged exclusively upon me; and that I should hear more about it ere long."

In his book, page 232, he says:

"Since the communication of his (Mr. Russell's) letters to the House of Representatives, the uses for which it was supposed the production of them was intended, and to which they were adapted, have not been altogether abandoned in some parts of the western country. The St. Louis Enquirer, has pursued this purpose in the simplest form, by publishing the message of the President of the United States to the House of Representatives, of the 7th May, and Mr. Russell's private letter, and by suppressing the duplicate and the remarks. In the Kentucky Reporter, published in Lexington, and in the Argus of Western America, published in Frankfort, various publications have appeared, exhibiting similar views of the subject, representing the proposition made to the British Plenipotentiaries on the 1st December, 1814, as a very grievous offence, and ascribing it exclusively to me."

In page 254, he further says: "The perusal of Mr. Russell's duplicate, disclosed to me the mistery of ruin which had been brewing against me, from the very day after the signature of the treaty of Ghent. It was by representations like those of that letter, that the minds of my fellow-citizens in the west, had for a succession of years been abused and ulcerated against me. That letter, indeed, inculpated the whole majority of the mission of Ghent; but subsidiary slander had performed its part of pointing all the guilt, and fastening all the responsibility of the crime upon me."

The allusions to Mr. Clay, and the imputations cast on him by Mr. Adams, were too obvious and too severe to pass without notice, and he came out in the Intelligencer with the famous letter about the Ghent negotiation, from which the quotation in the text above is taken.

c Vide National Intelligencer, Dec. 17, 1822.

d The Kentucky Reporter, a paper edited by a near relative of Mr. Clay, and long known as the organ of his opinions, as early as July 1st 1815, in an article headed "*Present state of Parties,*" said of Mr. Adams, "he was not born or educated a republican; but on the contrary, his whole life has been distinguished by a decided attachment for, and we believe, an intemperate zeal in support of, the principles of his father, and the aristocracy of the country. It is true, he abandoned the service of his old friends for the enjoyment of office, but we have never heard that he abandoned his federal principles to adopt republicanism."

The same paper of July 15th, 1825, under

the head of "*next election of President*," says, "The other point which we deem very important, and which we hope to gain, is, that he (Mr. Monroe) shall not be suffered to appoint his successor. Jefferson and Madison have both exercised this power, but we trust the *precedent* will be followed no further: it is time to take alarm, our objection lies chiefly to the *principle*, though, if it were necessary, we could state some objections to the *man* also. But in regard to him we feel indifferent. We should object to any man as President, who was *not the free and regular choice of the people*. Mr Adams is designated by the President and his presses as the *heir apparent*, the next successor to the Presidency. Since the principle was introduced, there has been a *rapid degeneracy in the Chief Magistrate*; and the PROSPECT of still GREATER DEGENERACY is STRONG and ALARMING. Admit the people should acquiesce in the Presidential appointment of Mr. Adams to this high office; who again will he choose as his successor? Will it be Josiah Quincy, H. G. Otis, or Rufus King? An *Aristocrat*, at least, if not a TRAITOR, will be our portion."

And the same paper of the next week, following up the same subject says, "the selection of Mr. Adams, the *son*, to be Secretary of State and successor in the Presidency, a gentleman who is well understood to have imbibed the politics of his father, was an indication, if the Intelligencer had not let out the fact, that Mr. Monroe venerates the administration of Mr. Adams, and of course will take it for his model."

The same violent opposition to Mr. Adams was continued in the Reporter and other papers which supported Mr. Clay's pretensions in the West, from the date of the above publications until the electoral election, and upon the same grounds which were asserted in the more formal exposition of the principles and views of Mr Clay's particular friends, as will appear from the following:—Extracts from a circular Address of a meeting held at Columbus, Ohio, the 15th July, 1824, for the purpose of nominating H. Clay, for the Presidency.

"The names of at least three members of Mr. Monroe's Cabinet, were pretty distinctly presented to the public, as candidates to succeed him. Reflecting men could not but see, that a struggle for the Presidency, between the principal Secretaries was fraught with much evil to the nation, inasmuch as it must distract the harmony of her councils, if it did not endanger the integrity of the functionaries, and jeopardize her peace and her reputation. Besides these mischiefs, to select one of the Secretaries, was to continue the same influence in office, which would virtually be a departure from the maxim, that rotation in office was essential to the preservation of the Republic. For, to change the man and to retain the influence, would be to repose upon the shadow and abandon the substance. The considerations briefly stated, determined many of the most reflecting citizens of the country to adopt the opinion, that *no member of the Executive Cabinet* ought to be selected to succeed Mr Monroe, and this determination was formed without any disrespect to the talents or character of the incumbents themselves. It rested upon *public principle* and *public duty* and upon these alone."

In another part of the same address, it is stated to be the first object with Mr. Clay's friends to prevent ONE OF THE CABINET from being placed in the Presidential Chair.

"It was particularly hoped that the *Western* country would have presented an undivided phalanx upon this great public question, and it is *deeply regretted* that *another candidate*, should be named and supported in the *West*, with the *same object* and for the *same purpose*."

Mr. CLAY's opinions undergo a sudden change after the election devolved upon the House of Representatives, from which he was excluded, as will appear from the following extract from his address to his constituents, being an apology for his conduct in voting for Mr. Adams, published in the National Journal of the 28th March, 1825.

I saw in his (Mr. Adams,) election the establishment of no dangerous example. I saw in it on the contrary *only conformity to the* SAFE PRECEDENTS, *which had been established in the instances of* Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MADISON *and* Mr. MONROE, who had respectively filled the same office from which he was translated."

(3) When the above address was first published in May 1827, the train of circumstances, were known to the public, terminating in an interchange of the highest political favors and services between *previously hostile rivals* and *antagonist in principle and policy*, the one by his vote and influence making the other President, and receiving in return the highest office in that President's gift, was thought to afford the strongest proof of a corrupt understanding between the parties, that the nature of the transaction, which they would instinctively seek to shroud in darkness, seemed to admit. Still more conclusive and positive evidence, however was destined to be brought to light by the imprudence of the friends of Mr. CLAY, who by the introduction of the *white washing* resolutions, mentioned in a previous note, into the Senate of Kentucky, rendered the investigation, which took place before that body, unavoidable.

Desirous that his friends in Congress, according to the language of their circular, issued on the 25th of May, 1824, in case of his being excluded from the House "should be able by concentration to control the event" of the election, "and hold in their hands the balance, and determine between the opposing and conflicting interests: Mr. CLAY, as early as the month of October, 1824, according to the statement of T. P. MOORE, a member of Congress from Kentucky, expressed at Frankfort, "an apprehension, that he should be excluded from the House of Representatives," and observed with seeming carelessness of manner, that "it would be best for us (meaning himself and his friends in Congress) in that case to remain *uncommitted* as to our second choice.

C. A. WICKLIFFE, another member from Kentucky, stated in a letter to the Jackson corresponding Committee for the District of Columbia, that Mr. CLAY said to him, at the same court in Frankfort, that in case he should be excluded from the House "he thought it best, that his friends should not hastily *commit* themselves in their second choice."

THOMAS D. CARNEAL, a member of the Senate of Kentucky, stated in the investigation be-

fore that body, that Mr. Clay, a few days before he started for Washington in the fall of 1824, said, "he did not like to be instructed by the Legislature as to his vote," and that "in case he were excluded from the House, he was wholly *uncommitted*, as to his vote and wished to be left free."

Mr. Moore, stated in a letter to the same Committee, that Mr. Clay after his arrival at Washington, called to see him, and told him in emphatic terms, that "he had little doubt, that he was excluded from the House of Representatives, and that all we," (meaning the Kentucky Delegation in Congress,) "had now to do, was to hold ourselves *uncommitted*, as to our second choice, declaring "that we could vote for neither of the three candidates and justify ourselves to our constituents." Major R. P. Henry, another member of Congress from Kentucky, now no more, detailed a similar conversation, which had taken place between himself and Mr. Clay.

Notwithstanding the impression which Mr. Clay was evidently desirous of making by persuading others to remain *uncommitted*, that he was himself also *uncommitted* and free to vote for either of the three candidates returned to the House, he, nevertheless, in his late Address, page 15, says—"this testimony establishes, that on various occasions and times, beginning in Kentucky about the 1st October, 1824," (the very time he began to inculcate the doctrine of *non-committal*), "and continued in the city of Washington down to the period when my determination to vote for Mr. Adams was generally known in this city," (Washington) "I uniformly expressed my conviction of General Jackson's want of qualification, and *my fixed resolution not to vote for him*, if I were called upon to give a vote." In page 17, he says—"so unalterably fixed was my resolution prior to my departure for Kentucky." In page 20, he says—"Here then is an unbroken chain of testimony, commencing early in October, 1824, and extending to nearly the end of the year, establishing beyond all controversy, my *fixed* and *unwavering decision* not to vote for General Jackson."

If this *chain of testimony* be not broken by the attempts above detailed to make the impression, that he was *uncommitted*, into how many fragments is it not shattered by the following unexpected blow from Gen. Floyd, of Virginia? That gentleman, in a letter to Gen. Van Ness, recently published, states, that in a conversation, in the month of January, or the latter part of the preceding month, December, whilst the election of the President was then before the House of Representatives, Mr Clay said to him—"When I take up the pretensions of Mr. Adams and weigh them, and lay them down; then take up the pretensions of General Jackson, weigh them and lay them down by the side of those of Mr. Adams, I never was as often puzzled in my life, as I am to decide between them."

The clue to unravel the dark intrigue that required of its author to present such diverse and contrarient views of the State of his own mind, through a period of three months, that he might be furnished with excuses, if not the means of justification, in taking whatever course his interest might ultimately dictate, is disclosed in the testimony of John S. Hitt, of Bourbon, who stated before the Senate of Kentucky, "that in 1825, on the 4th or 5th January, he went into Washington City in the evening, and was in company with Gen. Metcalfe, and asked him for information relative to the Presidential election? He said he knew little more than when he first arrived, or than witness; that the friends of Jackson would come to us and say, we hear you are going to vote for Mr. Adams; and the friends of Adams would come to us and say, we understand you are going to vote for Jackson; and so of the friends of Crawford; that we stand *uncommitted*, and *we must know something about how the cabinet is to be filled*."

J. Dudley, a member of the Senate, being called on, stated on the floor of the Senate that "in January 1825, F. P. Blair," (the intimate and confidential correspondent and friend of Mr. Clay, who, as was proved by another witness, had stated three or four weeks before the Presidential election, *that Mr. Clay would be Secretary of State, if Mr. Adams was made President*, and who had refused to swear, when called on, upon the ground, that the information he had, was obtained in the course of friendly communications and *private correspondence, which he deemed confidential*) came into the Senate Chamber, seated himself near me, and inquired my opinion on the resolutions past requesting our members of Congress to vote for Gen. Jackson as President of the United Sates. Mr. B. desired that I would write letters requesting the members, and particularly D. White, from this district, to consult with Mr. Clay and *vote as he might desire*. To this I objected, and gave my reasons therefor. Mr. B appeared surprised that I should raise any objections, particularly as I was opposed to the resolutions. He said, that a number of members of both houses, who voted for the resolution, *had written such letters*, and that I could do it with more propriety. He said, *if Mr. White could be induced to vote for Mr. Adams, he would obtain the vote of Kentucky, and with it the votes of most of the Western States, which would elect him; in which case Mr. Clay would obtain the appointment of Secretary of State.* I then inquired how that fact had been ascertained? His answer was, that *letters had been received from gentlemen of undoubted veracity, at Washington City, containing such information*, and I might rely with confidence on that statement. I replied that, although I was opposed to the resolutions, I had no doubt they contained the truth, and therefore I could not say one word to induce our members of Congress to believe otherwise."

It was proved, by Mr. Moore, that afterwards Mr. White, said before the election came on that "*he was not about to vote for Mr. Adams but for Mr Clay.*

Mr. Moore also stated, that he "received two letters from a *confidential friend* of Mr Clay's residing in Kentucky, urging him to *vote for whoever would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State, and intimating that Mr. Adams would do it.*

After ascertaining, to use the words of Gen. Metcalfe, *how the Cabinet was to be filled*, the majority of the Kentucky delegation made up their minds and did vote for Mr. Adams; and Mr. Clay was made *Secretary of State*. In the investigation before the Senate, of Kentucky, it was proved, that Francis Johnson, a member of Congress from that State, being asked after

his return home by some of his constituents, "how he came to vote for Mr. ADAMS"? answered "*that he voted for Mr.* ADAMS *to get Mr.* CLAY *made Secretary of State.*"

It was proved, that Gen. METCALFE on being told that voting for Mr. ADAMS would be an up-hill business in Kentucky, replied, "*I believe we have done too much for our friend.*" After his return home, he said to a constituent, as a reason, why he voted for Mr. ADAMS, "*we could not possibly get Mr.* CLAY *in the Cabinet without voting for and electing Mr.* ADAMS.

And finally, although it was established by the testimony of more than a dozen witnesses, that David Trimble, another member from Kentucky, had, previous to the late Presidential election, in various electioneering speeches and conversations, and at different times, expressed his dislike and opposition to Mr. ADAMS, in the strongest terms, and said, as he did in a speech on the Court-house steps in Flemingsburgh, that the elder John Adams was the most dangerous man in government in his day, and that young John Q. Adams was a chip of the old block; if any odds, worse; that in the treaty at Ghent, he wanted *to barter away the navigation of the Mississippi*, the key stone of the Western country, *for a mess of codfish;* that he was always considered an apostate federalist; that he always had been *hostile to the West;* and that we never will have an equal chance with the Eastern people, until we get a *Western* President; that we now have a chance in the West, for we have *two* candidates for the Presidency; and that he thought HENRY CLAY was the strongest; and *if we could not get him, we have another chance in the West, to wit,* Gen. JACKSON;" yet notwithstanding all these denunciations, and this decided expression of preference for Gen. JACKSON, next to Mr. CLAY, he voted for JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, and on being called to account for it by his constituents, on various occasions, and at different places, assigned as his reasons for disregarding their will, as was proved by EIGHTEEN witnesses, some of whom were members of the Kentucky Legislature, that "*it was* DISTINCTLY ASCERTAINED, that Mr. ADAMS *would make* Mr. CLAY, *Secretary of State, and that* Gen. JACKSON *would not.*"

This proof is sufficient to satisfy an ordinary mind, that Mr. Clay and his friends voted for Mr. Adams with a view to the appointment of Mr. Clay to be Secretary of State. Yet Mr. Clay, in an address to the public, dated at Lexington, 29th of June, 1827, says:

"I neither made, nor authorized, nor knew of any proposition whatever to either of the three candidates who were returned to the House of Representatives at the last Presidential election, or to the friends of either of them for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, or for any other purpose. And all allegations, intimations and inuendoes that my vote, on that occasion, was offered to be given, or was in fact given, in consideration of any stipulation or understanding, express or implied, direct or indirect, written or verbal, that I was, or that any other person was not, to be appointed Secretary of State, or that I was, in any other manner, to be personally benefitted, are devoid of all truth, and destitute of any foundation whatever."

In the same address Mr. Clay says:

"It will be universally admitted, that the accusation is of the most serious nature. Hardly any more atrocious could be preferred against a representative of the people in his official character. The charge in substance is, that deliberate "propositions of bargain" were made by my Congressional friends collectively, through an authorized and distinguished member of Congress, to Gen. Jackson; that their object was, by these "means of bargain and corruption," to exclude Mr. Adams from the Department of State, or to secure my promotion to office; and, that I was privy and assented to those propositions and to the employment of those means.

Such being the accusation and the prosecutor, and the issue between us, I have now a right to expect that he will substantiate his charges by the exhibition of satisfactory evidence. In that event, there is no punishment which would exceed the measure of my offence."

Unfortunately for Mr. Clay's reputation, a correspondence between himself and Mr. Blair of Kentucky, and between Messrs. Blair, Crittenden and White, confirms the charge which is here denied. Mr. Clay refused to publish his letters to Mr. Blair—but gave his consent that a copy should be placed in the hands of his political friends in Frankfort Kentucky, by whom they were shown to Mr. Kendall the editor of the Kentucky Argus. That gentleman in a letter to Mr. Clay speaks of one of them as follows:

"Let the date be recollected—*It is January* 8th, 1825.—You commence by giving Mr. Blair your opinion upon a work by Lord Byron which you say you have sent him—(*franked I presume.*) You then enter into the subject of the presidential election, and say, that the time has now arrived when you must begin to think seriously for whom you are to vote. You state, that the friends of all the candidates entertained the opinion that on you rested the decision of the contest, and that your situation was singular and amusing. You say that the friends of several candidates accost you in turn; that a friend of General Jackson says to you, My dear Sir, my hopes are upon you—do not disappoint us—our partiality was for you next to the hero—you know the anxiety we all had for a Western President: That a friend of Mr. Crawford comes and says, the hopes of the republican party are upon you; you and Mr. Crawford were the only republican candidates; had you been returned to the House, we should all have concentrated our force upon you. The language of Mr. Adams' friends, you give in nearly the following words.

"A friend of Mr. Adams comes to me "with tears in his eyes" and says—Sir, Mr. Adams has always had the greatest respect for you, and the highest admiration for your talents. There is no station to which you are not equal. You were undoubtedly the second choice of New England, and I pray you to consider whether the public good and your own future interests do not distinctly point you to the course which you ought to pursue."

"You then give some reasons why Mr. Adams should be prefered to General Jackson, among which I remember only the statement that the Ohio delegation had determined to vote for Mr. Adams, the alleged want of qualification in the

neral and his military propensities. You n declare distinctly, and in nearly the following words."

"My friends entertain the belief that their l wishes towards me, will, in the end, be e likely to be accomplished, by so bestowtheir votes."

"ou then declare, that you have urged them e governed by their views of the public good ne, and aver that you have been influenced by that consideration. In conclusion, you nearly the following words:

"Your representative is inclined to concur n us in these sentiments, and as I know his ject for your opinion, I request if you conin our views that you will write to him by rn mail to strengthen him in his inclinas. Shew this to Crittenden alone."

"ou say you could not publish this letter withpublishing letters from Mr. Blair, to show he understood it. This was written on the of January. About the 20th he must have eived it. I have stated, and he has admitthat about the 20th, he told me that *Mr. ms if elected, would make you Secretary of te.* Does not this show how he understood it?"

"The letter concludes by saying, "*shew this Crittenden alone.*" Doubtless it was shewn im. On the 19th January, Mr. Crittenden te to "*our representative,*" [Mr. White,] as ows:"

"Think as I do of Mr. Clay—of his great inrity, his lofty American spirit, and his conmate ability, I believe it to be highly impor- to the public interest that he should occy a distinguished station in the Executive partment. Under all present circumstances, *first wish in relation to this subject* (and it is dictated both by my personal partialities considerations of the public good (*would that Jackson should be the President and Clay Secretary of State.* And I really do believe, the common good is more concerned in y's being Secretary, than it is in the ques- whether Jackson or Adams shall be the sident."

"Does not this show how *he* understood it?

"On the *same day*, Mr. Blair wrote to "*our resentative*" [Mr. White] as follows:

"You have it in you power to vote not only n a view to the first officer, but probably in rence to the whole administration. Under e circumstances, the latter consideration ht deservedly be more influential than the , as the selection of the managers of the dements not only involves in a great degree, conduct of public affairs throughout the sidential term, but probably will decide next presidential election." Again—"if ad been thought that Mr. Adams would be ted, and if elected, would give Mr. Clay the iest place in his cabinet, there is scarcely a bt that the vote [of the Kentucky Legisla-] would have been in favor of Mr. Adams."

"Does not this further shew how *he* underd it?"

"You say in your letter to Mr. Blair, that your iends entertain the belief, that their *kind hes towards you* would be most likely to be mplished by voting for Mr. Adams. What e their "*kind wishes?*" Doubtless the *nd wishes*" of your friends in Frankfort and shington, were the same. We have seen that the "kind wishes" of Messrs. Blair and Crittenden were, that you should be Secretary of State, as a stepping stone to the presidency.

Mr. Trimble said, after he came home, that he "voted for Mr. Adams because it was distinctly ascertained, that he would make you Secretary of State." This shows what were his "kind wishes."

"Gen. Metcalfe said, they "could not possibly get Mr. Clay made Secretary of State without voting for and electing Mr. Adams." This proves what were his "kind wishes."

"Mr. Fr. Johnson said, he "voted for Mr. Adams to get Mr. Clay made Secretary of State." This shows what were his "kind wishes."

"Mr. White was not quite "*kind* enough, and you undertook to get letters from some of your friends among his constituents to "strengthen him in his inclinations," and warm up his "kind wishes."

Mr. White in a letter of June 27th 1828, says:

"My correspondents were numerous, and from the coincidence of their views and sentiments, I had reason to believe that it would be most agreeable to my constituents, and strictly consistent with the wishes of a majority of them, to adopt the course which I did finally pursue. That such communications, voluntarily made, from highly respectable and intelligent gentlemen, differing on local politics and leaders of parties at that time, on a subject of such deep interest and pressing emergency as that of the election of a Chief Magistrate, should have a powerful influence on my mind, is perfect natural. That I was confirmed in my vote by their suggestions, I do freely acknowledge; and, therefore, as I have often heretofore, frankly avowed, I now state, that I voted for Mr. Adams with a view to promote Mr. Clay's future prospects for the presidency. In confirming this avowal, I do not mean to say, that others, either in or out of Congress, were or were not influenced by the same motive. So far as I was informed on the subject, every circumstance tended to rivet on my mind the impression, that the people of Kentucky, and particularly of my district, looked forward to the advancement of Mr. Clay's future success with a more intense interest than to the success of either of the candidates then before the House of Representatives; and whatever might have been my own inclinations and preferences on the occasion, I felt that I was bound by a duty paramount to all others, which was to give the vote according to the will of a majority of my immediate constituents. Mr. Clay's promotion out of the way, it is not probable that Mr. Adams would have got the suffrages of the State of Kentucky in Congress; neither would I have been advised to support Mr. Adams, with a view to Mr. Clay's preferment. I would not have voted for the present incumbent, under any other circumstances than those which I had reason to believe would have met the approbation of the people."

By a comparison of these extracts and dates, it will be found that it was the first wish of some, if not all of Mr. Clay's friends, that Gen. Jackson should be President, and Mr. Clay Secretary of State. From the letters of General Jackson to Carter Beverly, and Mr. Buchanan's address in reply, it appears that Mr. Clay ascertained early

in January, that Gen. Jackson would give no pledge as to whom *he* would appoint Secretary of State. On the 8th, Mr. Clay wrote to Mr. Blair requesting him to write to Mr White to strengthen his disposition to vote for Mr. Adams—why? Not because the election of Mr. Adams would promote the "American System." Not because it would protect "Domestic Industry," or favor "Internal Improvement," but because it would *promote Mr. Clay's "future interests"* In accordance with these instructions, Mr. Blair and Mr. Crittenden did procure numerous letters to be written to Mr. White, expressly avowing the wish of the writers, that Mr. White should give his vote with a view to secure the office of Secretary of State for Mr. Clay. Mr. Adams was elected, and Mr Clay was appointed. Secretary. Can any one doubt that, that there was an understanding between Mr. Clay and Mr. Adams?

If any thing more were wanting, it is furnished in the following extract of a letter from the Hon. John McLane, at that time a Senator in Congress from Illinois, addressed to the Hon. John H. Eaton. Mr. McLane says:

"The bargain of 1825, between Messrs Adams and Clay, I remember well, was freely spoken of by many members of Congress, although I had no personal knowledge of any fact which would warrant the belief *that the contract existed*; besides the high estimation in which I then held Mr. Clay, forbade my suspicions on any accusations not supported by *positive proof*; that proof was not afforded me, and I held him guiltless; yet there were *some circumstances of unfavorable appearance, and which, as the friend of Mr. Clay, I was sorry had existence.* The circumstances to which I allude, were the *continued silence and lengthy reserve of Mr Clay's friends, in publishing or letting it be known how they would vote; and the fact that the Kentucky delegation, who voted for Mr. A. had a meeting to determine upon their course as I was informed by one of them, at which, it was said to me, that upon the question being proposed to Mr. Clay, for whom shall we vote?* He answered, in substance, "*that in case General Jackson should be elected, he believed that the administration, with its weight, would be opposed to him, to prostrate him*; that, should Mr. A. be elected, he felt satisfied it would not be so, *but that he hoped no personal consideration for him, would induce them to act contrary to their desire.*" Upon these circumstances, I have often remarked, that the first was *in character of Kentuckians; that the last was the strongest appeal which could be made to a man's friends, and the basest requisition which could be levied on their attachment.*"

e "The fact is notorious, that during the year preceding Mr. Adams' election, the National Journal was universally recognized, both by his friends and opponents as the advocate of his pretensions and the organ of his views. We find no fault with him on this account; but we do contend that when a candidate for popular favor permits himself to be supported for the highest office in the gift of the people, by a press directly under his eye, upon the the express ground, that he holds certain principles, and will endeavour to cause certain measures to be adopted; he is guilty of a flagrant breach of good faith, if he afterwards abandons those principles, and exerts his influence to defeat those measures." We shall be able to decide, by the following extracts how faithfully Mr. Adams has adhered to the promise by which he ascended to power.

In the National Journal of the 10th of August 1824, are these authorative declarations:

"If Mr Adams should be elected, we think we may safely affirm our belief, that he will conscientiously and firmly do all that it may be proper for him to do, to secure the election of the President in the hands of the People." "If Mr. Clay should be elected, he and his friends will be bound by a regard for consistency, if by no political considerations, to pursue the same course. We sincerely believe that an election by the *People, in the worst possible mode*, that could be devised by those whose object was to devise the best, would be infinitely preferable to the *best possible mode of electing a President, in which Congress or the State Legislatures have any concern.*"

The Journal of the 19th October, contains the following.

"The chief magistrate, when elected, has the whole patronage of the nation in his hand and may reward with honor or profit, those who have been active in his election. Thus when the power of choosing is exercised by a few they may be tempted from the path of duty and induced to vote in opposition to the popular will What a prophetic foresight of "coming events!"

On another occasion (August 10) we have this strong denunciation of conduct, since vindicated by the same authority:—"When the voice of the people is proclaimed, *the representative*, if he be true to his trust, *is bound to respond to that voice, and give it its full effect; if he do not, he no longer represents the people, but an aristocrat and usurper.*" And again, (November 18,) "Is the public servant under no obligation to respect the will of his constituent—Can it be doubted that those who have thus *usurped* and *trampled* on the rights of the people, would, were it in their power, put down the Sovereignty of the People and confederate with the Hol. Alliance, to maintain their usurpation." Such are the unsparing terms in which Mr. Adams, through his semi-official organ, unsparingly denounced, by anticipation, the means by which he has "*usurped and trampled on the rights of the people.*" These are not our words —'out of his own mouth we condemn him.' To show the strong and decided opinion formerly entertained of the district system, we quote from the Journal of 20th November "Let the right of choice be given directly to the people, in districts; there can be then no cavilling about what is, and what is not, the will of the people; and above all, let the mode of election, whatever it be, be uniform throughout the United States. It is thus only that the rights of the majority can be properly secured."

Such were the avowed principles of Mr. Adams while a candidate; principles directly hostile to his subsequent practices.

f Upon Mr McDuffie's resolution, in April 1825, to refer the proposition to amend the Constitution, the vote stood thus:

Maine.

Yeas—Messrs. Anderson and Lincoln.

Nays—Messrs. Kidder, O'Brien, Sprague and Herrick.

New-Hampshire.

Yeas -

Nays—Messrs. Bartlett, Brown, Eastman, Healy and Whipple.

Vermont.

Yeas—

Nays—Messrs. Bradley, Mallary, Mattocks, and Wales.

Rhode-Island.

Yeas—

Nays—Mr. Pearce.

Massachusetts.

Yeas—Messrs. Bailey and Baylies.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Davis, Dwight, Everett, Crowninshield, Locke, Reed, Varnum, and Webster.

Connecticut.

Yeas—

Nays—Messrs Baldwin, Barber, Ingersol, Phelps, Tomlinson and Merwin.

New-York.

Yeas—Messrs Adams, Angel, Ashley, Badger, Cambreleng, Deitz, Fosdick, Garnsey, Hallock, Hoffman, Hayden, Huguein, Humphrey, Kellogg, McManus, Martindale, Markell, Marvin, Miller, Porter, Ross, Rose, Verplanck, Ward, Whittemore and Wood.

Nays—Messrs. Hushbrook, Van Rennsalaer, Sands, Storrs, Strong, Taylor and White.

New-Jersey.

Yeas—Messrs. Cassedy, Garrison and Tucker.

Nays—Messrs. Condict and Swann.

Delaware.

Yeas—

Nays—Mr. McLane.

Pennsylvania.

Yeas—Messrs. Addams, Buchanan, Edwards, Findlay, Harris, Hemphill, Ingham, Kremer, Lawrence, Markley, Mitchell, McKean, Orr, Plumer, Stewart, Stevenson, Thompson J. Wilson, H. Wilson, Wolfand Wurts.

Nays—Mr. Miner.

Maryland.

Yeas—Messrs. Barney, Kerr, Little, Mitchell, Peter and Worthington.

Nays—

Virginia.

Yeas—Messrs. Alexander, Armstrong, Barbour, Bassett, Davenport, Estill, Claiborne, Johnson, Mercer, McCoy, Powell, Rives, Smith, Taliaferro, Taylor, Trezvant, Stevenson and Crump.

Nays—Mr. Newton.

North-Carolina.

Yeas—Messrs. Alston, Carson, Edwards, Conner, Hines, Holmes, Long, Mangum, McNeil, Sawyer, Saunders and Williams.

Nays—Mr. Bryan.

South Carolina.

Yeas—Messrs. Carter, Gist, Gorman, Hamilton, McDuffie, Tucker, Wilson and Drayton.

Nays—

Georgia.

Yeas—Messrs. Carey, Haynes, Merriwether, Tattnall and Thompson.

Nays—Mr. Forsyth.

Kentucky.

Yeas—Messrs. Buckner, Henry, J. Johnson, R. Johnson, Lecompte, Letcher, Moore, Metcalfe, Trimble, Young and Wickliffe.

Nays—Mr. Clarke.

Tennessee.

Yeas—Messrs. Alexander, Allen, Blair, Cocke, Isaacs, Marable, Mitchel, Houston and Polk.

Nays—

Ohio.

Yeas—Messrs. Campbell, Finlay, McLean, Thompson, Wilson and Woods.

Nays—Messrs. Bartley, Beecher, Bradley, Sloane, Vinton, Whittlesey, Vance and Wright.

Louisiana.

Yeas—Messrs. Brent, Gurley and Livingston.

Nays—

Indiana.

Yeas—Messrs. Jennings, Boone and Test.

Nays—

Mississippi.

No Representative.

Illinois.

Yeas—Mr. Cook.

Nays—

Alabama.

Yeas—Messrs. Moore and Owen.

Nays—

Missouri.

Yeas—Mr. J. Scott.

Nays—

The force of public sentiment is made manifest—in the New England States, where Mr. Adams was popular, his friend in Congress voted against a proposition which he was pledged to support, lest their votes in favor of such propositions should be used as an argument, against the manner of his election. In Delaware the talented representative was known to have been opposed to Mr. Adams. He had not violated the will of his constituents by voting for an *unpopular* constitutional President, and desirous to preserve the weight and influence of his State, he was opposed to any amendment which might lessen her influence, which under the present constitution with one two hundred and thirteenth part of the representation, gave her one twenty-fourth of the choice of a President. Yet the Representatives of Missouri and Illinois, States *similarly* situated, and of Louisiana two of whom had voted for Mr. Adams, were impelled by public sentiment to vote for the reference.

The policy of the Administration and the force of public sentiment are strikingly illustrated by the following table:

For the amendment.	Against it.
New York,	Maine,
New Jersey,	New Hampshire,
Pennsylvania,	Vermont,
Maryland,	Rhode Island,
Virginia,	Massachusetts,
North Carolina,	Connecticut,
South Carolina,	Delaware.
Georgia,	
Kentucky,	
Tennessee,	
Louisiana,	
Indiana,	
Alabama,	
Illinois,	
Missouri.	

g Mr. Clay, in a speech delivered in Congress on the 14th January 1817, on the repeal

the famous *Compensation Law*, asserts the doctrine of obedience on the part of the Representatives to the will of their constituents in the following language, equally broad and strong; Mr. Clay said—"He agreed perfectly in the sentiment, that instructions, given by the people are obligatory on the Representative. This was a principle, consecrated by the Revolution, inseparable from all free government, and which he therefore hoped never to see departed from in practice under ours. Whilst, then, he had a seat on this floor, it was immaterial *how* he arrived at the will of his constituents, or *what were the evidences of it; it was sufficient that he should know it.*" Vide National Intelligencer, January 28, 1817.

h Extract from a Circular published at Washington, by the friends of Mr. Clay in Congress, May 25, 1824:

"If contrary to all probability, Mr. Clay should not be returned to the House, his friends, having done their duty, will be able *by concentration to control the event:—they hold in their hands the balance:*—they will determine between the opposing and conflicting interests."

Extract from a Circular Address of a Committee of Correspondence appointed by Mr. Clay's friends in the Legislature of Kentucky: "And let them (the people) remember that, after the "choice of electors once "takes place, their "voice will no more be heard in this contest. All "will be carried by *influence and intrigue, bar-*"*gain and management.* He who has the most "extensive means of influence, and will pro-"mise the most favors, will have the prospect "of success; and the nation will receive the "President, not from the pure hands of the "people, but *from a club of political managers* "*and intriguers.*"

The same committee proceed to say: "If he "(Mr Clay) be returned to the House of Re-"presentatives, we have little doubt of his final election!!!

(4) At the late election of President, in the House of Representatives, the votes of Delaware, Illinois, Missouri and Mississippi, and the casting votes of the great State of New York, and of Maryland, were held by individuals; so that six individuals had the disposal of the votes of six States, which is one quarter of the whole number. The *representative*—we should say, the *member*, who held the vote of Missouri, Mr. Scott, gave it against the will of his constituents and they turned him out at the next election—but Mr Adams rewarded him by a lucrative appointment. The member, who held the vote of Illinois, Daniel P Cook, voted against the will of the people and they turned him out also—but he was recompensed by Mr. Adams, by a secret mission to Cuba. The casting vote of Kentucky was given by Francis Johnson and David Trimble against the will of their constituents, who, at the next election, turned them out. If the votes of these three States, which were known before the election to prefer Gen. Jackson to Mr. Adams, and which have since, by their votes, at the last Congressional election, proved it, had been given according to the will of the people, Mr. Adams could not have been elected. Three being taken from Mr. Adams and given to Gen. Jackson would have made their respective numbers equal, each having ten votes. And it is well known, that when the friends of Mr. Crawford, who held the vote of Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware, had found his election hopeless, that the Representatives of at least three of those States—Georgia, North Carolina, and Delaware, would have taken General Jackson as their second choice, which would have given him a majority of the States; and it is well known that Col. Mitchell, of this State, who voted for Mr. Adams, under a pledge to his constituents, has declared that on a second ballot he would vote for Gen. Jackson and thus have increased the majority by the vote of Maryland.

i Mr. Lloyd of Massachusetts.

* Such were the sentiments expressed by Mr. Clay and his political friends, but a short time before the election. Mr. Scott, of Missouri, was a candidate for the nineteenth Congress, and in July, 1824, addressed a circular letter to the people of that State, from which the following is an extract:

"You are apprized, fellow citizens, that within my present term of service, should the election of President come before the House of Representatives, it is my bounden duty, and exalted priveledge, to have a voice in that election. The occasion wherein this question would have influenced you in electing me, who now offers to represent you in Congress, is past, is done, and cannot be undone. If your confidence is misplaced, as some would have you believe, it is now irremediable. But to satisfy you who have confided to me this important trust, and before whom I appear a candidate to represent you in the nineteenth Congress, I feel a willingess and desire, when all motive to conceal is past, to express, in this public address, my course on this momentous subject. In such an event (provided the election of electors is made by the people) I have two votes to give, one for an elector for President, another for a President; the first as a citizen of Missouri, the latter as the Representative of Missouri; one in this State, the other in the House of Representatives. In giving the former, my wishes being such as may be reasonably supposed to be entertained by a western man, I shall be governed by individual feelings, corrected by my best judgment. In giving the latter, I become the organ of the people, and the expressed will of the people will be my guide. I vote not as a citizen of Missouri, but as the Representative of Missouri; the vote belongs to the people, and not to me; and the voice of Missouri, will, in such case, as far as practicable, be the voice of her representative. These were my principles in 1822, and such are my principles in 1824, and such shall be my vote in the hall of the House of Representatives on the election of President, come when it may."

Yet Mr. Scott, re-elected to Congress under this pledge, voted for Mr. Adams, and afterwards admitted to the Rev. O. B. Brown, as we have before stated, that he knew that nineteen-twentieths of his constituents were opposed to him.

JACKSON REPUBLICAN.

A new paper, under this title, is published in Boston. We have received the first number. It is neatly executed, and promises to be an able auxiliary in the cause of the people.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*, subject to newspaper postage and *no more*.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, AUGUST 16, 1828. No. 23.

GEN. JACKSON AND GOV. SHELBY.

We to-day lay before our readers a letter from Tho. H. Shelby, another from Wm. B. Lewis, and the treaty to which they refer. We have not inserted the letter of Chas. S. Todd, whose misfortune seems to be that he was the son of a Circuit Judge, and the son-in-law of Governor Shelby. Some men there are, who, educated at the expense of the public, cannot live without the patronage of those in office,—such men are fit panders of corrupt politicians in office.

The letter of Mr. Lewis is in corroberation of General Jackson's known character, and contains additional evidence of his strength of mind and courteous deportment. The letter of Mr. Shelby if true, exhibits a jealousy on the part of Gov. Shelby which we will not characterise, and the declaration, that he would knock the old rascal twenty feet, which the son puts into the mouth of the father, if true, shows a violence of temper on the part of Gov. Shelby, entirely disreputable to him and altogether at war with his subsequent conduct. If Gov. Shelby had considered Gen. Jackson to be the "old rascal," the "corrupt" man which he is made afterwards to declare him to be, would he have visited General Jackson's house on his return home? Would he have remained there enjoying the hospitality of General Jackson's amiable lady until his portrait was painted by Mr. Earle? No, Gov. Shelby was a soldier. He himself had been slandered. His children cannot be ignorant that in 1806, Doctor Hunn had prepared an expose of Governor Shelby's revolutionary services, the publication of which was suppressed by the great efforts of Governor Shelby and his prominent friends. Thomas H. Shelby and Charles S. Todd, cannot be ignorant of the fact, that Governor Shelby was charged with the improper embezzlement of property, forcibly taken from the tories, during the revolution—and we cannot believe, that with a knowledge that charges had been made against himself, Governor Shelby would, if living, countenance the base attacks now made on the character of General Jackson. The fact stated by Mr. Lewis, that he, on his return, visited Mrs. Jackson, in the absence of her husband, is proof of his conviction, that the suspicions which he had entertained, were unjust and of his desire to atone as far as possible, for entertaining such suspicion, by thus publicly expressing his belief of Gen. Jackson's worth.

If we are correctly informed, one of Governor Shelby's daughters, immediately after his death, sent to the Hermitage, and had a copy taken of the portrait referred to by Major Lewis. Why so? Governor Shelby had no doubt spoken of this portrait to his family. Was Governor Shelby a hypocrite? Would he receive the hospitality and kindness of General Jackson in public, and abuse and slander him in private? To do so, would be to reveal his own disgrace to his family, while he sought to conceal it from the world. Governor Shelby understood the value of reputation too well to do this.

But to show what was General Jackson's opinion upon this subject, we quote a toast given by him at a public dinner in Nashville, on the 6th of September, 1819.

"Isaac Shelby, the Revolutionary Patriot and distinguished Hero."

No man, we believe, has charged Gen. Jackson with hypocrisy—that, we suppose is to be the last alternative. It is easy to see that the conduct of Gov. Shelby had been such as to satisfy Gen. Jackson, that whatever unkind feeling had originated at the treaty had been removed, and this toast was given to show to Gov. Shelby that Andrew Jackson was as courteous as he was firm.

But it is objected that too much was given for the land!! This charge was intended to operate upon Kentucky. So far as the people of Kentucky are concerned, the charge will fail. Impressed with the importance of locating a dense population on the shore of the Mississippi, it was always a favorite policy with Mr. Calhoun, to extinguish the Indian title to the lands west of the Cumberland, and south and west of the Tennessee rivers—by the treaty, Kentucky has now large tracts of vacant land yet to be sold, and the soldiers of the Revolution are permitted to enter upon the lands which were acquired in the defence of our rights in the war of '76.

The grant to Colbert is objected to. Let it be recollected that the grant to Colbert was only a confirmation of a grant made in a previous treaty. Colbert was a distinguished and influential Chief—he had done much to civilize his tribe, and his influence could have defeated the treaty. The reservation to Colbert was in accordance with the usages of the nation in its intercourse with the Indians. We have before us a treaty held with the Indians by Gov. Cass and Thomas L. McKenney, pet negotiators for this diplomatic administration, approved by John Quincy Adams, and published in the volume of the laws of the session before last. The 4th section of that treaty is in the following words:

SEC. 4. It being deemed important that the half breeds scattered through this extensive country, should be stimulated to exertion and improvement, by the possession of permanent property and fixed residencies, the Chippewa Tribe, in consideration of the affection they bear to these persons, and of the interest which they feel in their welfare, grant to each of the persons described in the schedule hereto annexed, being half breeds and Chippewa by descent, and it being understood that the schedule includes all this description who are attached to the government of the United States, six hundred and forty acres of land to be located under the direction of the President of the United S. upon the Island and shore of the St. Marys river, wherever good land enough for this purpose

can be found; and as soon as such locations are made, the jurisdiction and soil thereof are hereby ceded. It is the intention of the parties, that where circumstances will permit, the grants be surveyed in the ancient French manner, bounding not less than six arpens nor more than ten, upon the river and running back for quantity; and that where this cannot be done, such grants be surveyed in any manner the President may direct. The locations for Oshauguscodaywayqua and her descendents shall be adjoining the lower park of the military reservation, and upon the head of Sugar Island. The persons to whom grants are made shall not have the privilege of conveying the same, without the permission of the President.

The schedule referring to this section is as follows:

To Oshaugerscodáwagqua wife of John Johnson Esq. to each of her children, and to each of her grand children one section.

To Saugemauqua widow of the late John Baptiste Cadotte and to her children, Louison, Sophia, Archangel, Edward, and Polly, one section each.

To Kencesequa, wife of Samuel Ashman, and to each of her children, one section.

To Teegaushau, wife of Charles H. Okes, and to each of her children one section.

To Thomas Shaw, son of Obimetunoqua and to his wife Mary, being also of Indian descent, each one section.

To Fanny Levake, daughter of Meeshwauqua and to each of her grand children, one section.

To Obayshaunoquotolla, wife of Francis Gooley Jr. one section.

To Omuckackeenee, wife of John Holliday, and to each of her children, one section.

To Obimegeezhigoqua, wife of Joseph du Chene, Jr. and to each of her children, one section.

To Monedaqua, wife of Charles Cloutier, one section.

To Susan Yarns, daughter of Odanbitogeezhigoqua, one section.

To Henry Sayer, and John Sayer sons of Obemauunoqua each, one section.

To each of the children of John Tanner being of Chippewa descent, one section.

To Wassidjeewunoqua and to each of her children by George Johnson, one section.

To Michael Cadotte senior son of Equawaige, one section.

To Equaysayawy wife of Michael Cadotte, senior, and to each of her children living within the United States, one section.

To each of the children of Charlotte Warren, widow of the late Truman A. Warren, one section.

To Mary Chapman, daughter of Equamecg, and wife of Bela Chapman, and to each of her children, one section.

To Saganoshequa, wife of John H. Fairbanks, and to each of her children, one section.

To Shaughunamouee, wife of William Morrison, and to each of her children, one section.

To each of the children of the late Ingwaysub, wife of Joseph Cote, one section.

To each of the children of Angelique Cote, late wife of Pierre Cote, one section.

To Pazhikwntoqua, wife of William Aitkin, and to each of her children, one section.

To Susan Dasenpeau, grand daughter of Mishquabunoque, and wife of Ambrose Davenport, and to each of her children, one section.

To Wanbunequa, wife of Augustin Belanga, and to each of her children, one section.

To Charlotte Louisa Morrison, wife of Allan Morrison, and daughter of Manitowedjewimg, and to each of her children, one section.

To each of the children of Eustace Roussair, by Shauwúnaubunoqua, Wauwausswnoqua and Payshaubunoqua, one section.

To Isabella Dingley, wife of Daniel Dingley, and daughter of Pimegeczhigoqua, and to each of her children, one section.

To George Birkhead, being a Chippewa by descent, one section.

To Susan Conner, wife of Thomas Conner, and daughter of Pimegeeshegoqua, and to each of her children, one section.

To the children of George Ermatinger, being of Shawnee extraction, two sections collectively.

To Ossinahjeeunoqua, wife of Michael Cadotte, jr. and to each of her children, one section.

To Minedemoseyah, wife of Pierre Duvernay, one section.

Here we have diplomacy in style!! If the coalition desire to find abuses, let them examine into the diplomacy of this diplomatic administration.

TREATY WITH THE CHICKASAWS.

To settle all controversies, and to remove all ground of complaint or dissatisfaction that might arise to interrupt the peace and harmony which have so long and so happily existed, between the United States of America and the Chickasaw nation of Indians, James Monroe, President of the United States, by Isaac Shelby and Andrew Jackson, of the one part, and the whole Chickasaw nation, by their Chiefs, Head Men, and Warriors, in full council assembled, of the other part, have agreed on the following articles; which when ratified by the President and Senate of the United States of America shall form a treaty binding on all parties.

Art. 1. Peace and friendship are hereby firmly established and made perpetual between the United States of America and the Chickasaw nation of Indians.

Art. 2. To obtain the object of the foregoing article, the Chickasaw nation of Indians cede to the United States of America, (with the exception of such reservation as shall be hereafter mentioned) all claim or title which the said nation has to the land lying north of the south boundary of the State of Tennessee, which is bounded south by the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude, and which lands hereby ceded, lie within the following boundaries, viz: Beginning on the Tennessee river, about thirty-five miles, by water, below Col. George Colbert's ferry, where the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude strikes the same; thence due west with said degree of north latitude, to where it cuts the Mississippi river at or near the Chickasaw Bluffs; thence up the said Mississippi river to the mouth of the Ohio; thence up the Ohio river; to the mouth of Tennessee river; thence up the Tennessee river to the place of beginning.

Art. 3. In consideration of the relinquishment of claim and cession of lands in the preced-

ding article, and to perpetuate the happiness of the Chickasaw nation of Indians, the Commissioners of the United States, before named, agree to allow the said nation the sum of twenty thousand dollars per annum, for fifteen successive years to be paid annually; and as a further consideration for the objects aforesaid, and at the request of the chiefs of the said natinn, the Commissioners agree to pay Captain John Gordon of Tennessee, the sum of one thousand one hundred and fifteen dollars, it being a debt due by General William Colbert, of said nation, to the aforesaid Gordon; and the further sum of two thousand dollars, due by said nation of Indians to Captain David Smith, now of Kentucky, for that sum by him expended in supplying himself and forty-five soldiers from Tennessee, in the year one thousand seven hundred and ninety-five, when assisting them (at their request and invitation in defending their towns against the invasion of the Creek Indians; both of which sums on the application of the said nation) are to be paid within sixty days after the ratification of this treaty to the aforesaid Gordon and Smith.

Art. 4. The Commissioners agree on the further and particular application of the chiefs, and for the benefit of the poor and warriors of the said nation, that a tract of land, containing four miles square; to include a salt lick or spring on or near the river Sandy, a branch of the Tennessee and within the land hereby ceded, be reserved, and to be laid off in a square or oblong, so as to include the best timber, at the option of their beloved Chief Levi Colbert and Major James Brown, or either of them; who are hereby made agents and trustees for the nation, to lease the said salt lick or springs, on the following express conditions, viz: For the benefit of this reservation as before recited, the trustees or agents are bound to lease the said reservation to some citizen or citizens of the United States for a reasonable quantity of salt, to be paid annually to the said nation for the use thereof; and that, from and after two years after the ratification of this treaty, no salt made at the works to be erected on this reservation, shall be sold within the limits of the same for a higher price than one dollar per bushel of fifty pounds weight; on failure of which the lease shall be forfeited, and the reservation revert to the United States.

Art. 5. The Commissioners agree that there shall be paid to Oppassantubby, a principal Chief of the Chickasaw nation, within sixty days after the ratification of this treaty, the sum of five hundred dollars, as a full compensation for the reservation of two miles square, on the north side of the Tennessee river, secured to him and his heirs by the treaty, held with the said Chickasaw nation, on the twentieth day of September, 1816; and the further sum of twenty-five dollars to John Lewis, a half breed, for a saddle he lost while in the service of the U. States; and to show the regard the President of the U. S. has for the said Chickasaw nation, at the request of the Chiefs of the said nation; the Commissioners agree that the sum of one thousand and eighty-nine dollars shall be paid to Major James Colbert, Interpreter, within the period stated in the first part of this article, it being the amount of a sum of money taken from his pocket in the month of June, 1816, at the theatre in Baltimore. And the said Commissioners, as a further regard for said natio do agree that the reservations made to Geor Colbert and Levi Colbert in the Treaty held the Council House of said nation on the twe ty-sixth day of September, 1816, the first Col. George Colbert on the north side of t Tennessee river, and those to Major Levi Co hert on the east side of the Tombigbee rive shall enure to the sole use of the said Colon George Colbert, and Major Levi Colbert, the heirs and assigns forever, with their butts a bounds as defined by said treaty, and agreeab to the marks and boundaries as laid off an marked by the surveyor of the United State where that is the case, and where the reserv tions have not been laid off and marked by surveyor of the United States, the same shall b so done as soon after the ratification of this tre ty as practicable on the application of the r servees, or their legally appointed agent unde them, and agreeably to the definition in the bo fore recited treaty. This agreement is mad on the following express conditions: That th said land, and those living on it, shall be sub ject to the laws of the United States, and all le gal taxation that may be imposed on the land o citizens of the United States inhabiting th territory where the said land is situated.— The Commissioners further agree, that th the reservation secured to John McCleish o the north side of the Tennessee River by the before recited Treaty, in consequence of his having been raised in the State of Tennessee, and marrying a white woman, shall enure to the sole use of the said John McCleish, his heirs and assigns, forever, on the same conditions attached to the lands of Col. George Colbert and Maj. Levi Colbert, in this article.

Art. 6. The two contracting parties covenant and agree that the line of the South boundary of the State of Tennessee as described in the second article of this treaty, shall be ascertained and marked by Commissioners appointed by the President of the United States; that the marks shall be bold; the trees to be blazed on both sides of the line, and the fore and aft trees marked U. S; and that the commissioners shall be attended by two persons, to be designated by the Chickasaw nation; and the said nation shall have due and seasonable notice when said operation is to be commenced. It is further agreed by the Commissioners that all improvements actually made by individuals of the Chickasaw nation, which shall be found within the lands ceded by this Treaty, that a fair and reasonable compensation shall be paid therefor, to the respective individuals having made or owned the same.

Art. 7. In consideration of the friendly and conciliatory disposition evinced during the negotiation of this treaty by the Chickasaw chiefs and warriors but more particularly as a manifestation of the friendship and liberality of the President of the United States, the Commissioners agree to give on the ratification of this treaty to Chinnubby, King of the Chickasaw nation, to Teshuamingo, William McGilvery Anpassantubby, Samuel Seely, James Brown, Levi Colbert, Ickaryoncuttaha, George Pettigrove, Immartarharmicco, Chickasaw Chiefs, and to Malcolm Magee, interpreter to this treaty, each one hundred and fifty dollars, in cash;

Colbert, Hopoyeahaummar, Immauklusharhopoyea, Tushkarhopoye, Hopoyeahaummar, jr., Immauklusharhopyea, James Colbert, Coweamarthlar, Illachouwarhopoyea, military leaders, one hundred dollars each; and do further agree, that any annuity, heretofore secured to the Chickasaw, nation of Indians, by treaty, to be paid in goods, shall hereafter be paid in cash.

In testimony whereof, the said commissioners and undersigned chiefs and warriors have set their hands and seals. Done at the treaty ground, east of Old Town, this nineteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord, one thousand, eight hundred, and eighteen.

ISAAC SHELBY,
ANDREW JACKSON.

Levi Colbert, his X mark,
Samuel Seely, his X mark,
Chinnubby, King, his X mark,
Teshuamingo, his X mark,
William McGilvery, his X mark,
Arpashenshtubby, his X mark,
James Brown, his X mark,
Ickarryancuttaha, his X mark,
George Pettigrove, his X mark,
Immartaharmico, his X mark,
Major General William Colbert, his X mark,
Major William Glover, his X mark,
Hopayahaummar, his X mark,
Immoukusharhopoyea, his X mark,
Tuskalhopoyea, his X mark,
Hopoyahaummar, junr., his X mark,
Immauklusharopoyea, his X mark,
James Colbert, his X mark,
Cowemarthlar, his X mark,
Illackhanwarhopoyea, his X mark,
Colonel George Colbert, his X mark,

In the presence of

ROBERT BUTLER, *Adj. Gen. and Secretary.*
TH. J. SUERBURNF, *Agent for the Chickasaw nation of Indians.*
MALCOLM MCGEE, *Interpreter*, his x mark.
MARTIN COLBERT,
J. C. BRONAUGH, *Assistant Insp'r Gen. S. D.*
THOS. H. SHELBY, of Kentucky.
R. K. CALL, *Captain U. S. Army.*
BENJAMIN SMITH, of Kentucky.
RICHARD J. EASTER, *A. D. Q. M. Gen.*
M. B. WINCHESTER.
W. B. LEWIS.

Extract of a letter from Thomas H. Shelby, dated Grassland, April 28th, 1828.

My father set out on the 10th September, 1818, and arrived at Gen. Jackson's on the 17th, where he remained a few days, and in company with his colleague proceeded to Nashville. In a day or two we set out for the treaty ground, accompanied by eight or ten gentlemen, friends of Gen. Jackson, with all of whom, excepting Col. Butler, my father was acquainted. During the journey little was said on the subject of the treaty. I heard the General, on one occasion, ask my father how far he was willing to go for the Indian boundary. My father replied that he was prepared to go as high as $300,000 rather than not effect the purchase—but, said he, "Gen. Jackson, I have not the least idea that we shall find it necessary to give half that sum." After this conversation, a profound silence was observed by Gen. Jackson, and the friends who accompanied him, on the subject of the treaty, in my father's presence. At length we arrived at the treaty ground; the Indians assembled. My father soon observed great intercourse between the General and the Indians, of which he spoke frequently to me. On one occasion, the General and part of his suit were absent from camp all night; the General withheld the motive of his nocturnal visit from his colleague by studied silence on the subject. I did understand by some means, that the General passed the night with Colbert, one of the principal Chiefs. My father expressed to me his suspicions that "there was something not right going on." Before any Council had convened, the General informed his colleague "that some of the principal Chiefs were violently opposed to selling land, and that those fellows would have to be bought over." At length a counsel was called. Among other objections made by the Indians to the selling of their land, it was urged by them "that the United States were largely in arrears to them; and until old debts were paid, they would not contract new ones." The Commissioners found it necessary to send to Nashville for money to pay those claims, and thus remove the main difficulty In about a week, the messenger to Nashville arrives—the money is distributed agreeably to the census of the nation, taken during his absence. A second council is convened. Gen. Jackson inquires of the Chiefs—

"What do you ask for this land?"

Interpreter—"We don't know—what will you give?"

General J.—"We will give you $150,000."

Interpreter—"We can't take it."

General J.—"We will give you $200,000."

Interpreter—"No we cannot take it."

General J.—"We will give you $250,000."

Interpreter—"No, no."

"$300,000," says the General. My father left the table and the council broke up. The General observed to my father in conversation, that the Chiefs contended for the privilege of selling a large reservation of land to whom they might think proper. My father objected to this proposition; he said "they might sell it to the King of England." The General observed, "that there was then a company of gentlemen on the ground that would pay them down their price, $20,000." My father refused positively to permit the Indians to sell land to private individuals. He contended that the Government should have the option of taking the reservation at the price stipulated, and the General and the Chiefs were in the end obliged to consent to it.

My father told the General he had made the Indians offers that he could not sanction. "Why, Governor, God damn it, did not you say that you would give $300,000?" "No Sir, I give not authorize you to make any such proposition." The parties seemed on the very point of coming to blows, when I stepped between them, laying a hand on each, and entreating them to talk the matter over more dispassionately. My father told me afterwards, that it was well for the old rascal that I interfered, that he should have knocked him twenty feet. Not a word passed between the Commissioners until the next day, when the General broke out upon his colleague in a strain, if possible, more rough and boisterous than before. I again stept between them, and called on the friends of the General to interfere. Old Major Smith step-

ped up and observed, "Gentlemen, I am no dictator, but I will be moderator," and we kept them apart. My father told the General "he should leave him and go home." "Go, Governor," replied the General, "by God I will make the treaty without you." While our horses were saddling, the friends of General urged me to use my influence with my father, not to go. He at last agreed to remain. Another council was called. The Indians demanded the $300,000, and would treat for nothing less. Finally, the treaty was made. My father thought that Gen. Jackson's corruption and folly had cost the Government from 100,000 to 200,000 dollars. His mind under went no change upon this subject to the day of his death.

I have thus given you a detail of facts, which came under my own observation: you are at liberty to make what use of it you may think proper. Your friend,

THO. H. SELBY.

Col. C. S. Todd."

From the Frankfort Ky. Argus.

TO THE EDITORS.

GEN. JACKSON AND GOV. SHELBY.

NASHVILLE, July 12, 1828.

SIR—In the supplement of Mr. Clay's address to the public, published in December last, is a letter to him from Mr. C. S. Todd of your State, purporting to relate a convertation between the late Governor Shelby and Mr. Clay, in July, 1824, upon the subject of the Chickasaw treaty in 1818. Mr. Todd observes in his letter to Mr. Clay: "In appropriate connection with the preceding narrative, I can state the substance of a conversation of like tendency, had between yourself and our venerated friend, the late Gov. Shelby, at his residence, as early as the month of July, 1824. He commenced the conversation, by asking what you thuught of the prospects of Gen. Jackson in the approaching election. You replied by stating, that you did not believe he would be elected, and spoke freely and fully of his conduct and qualifications, very much in the manner you had treated of them in your public speeches—that you did not expect from him or his counsellors, any friendly feeling toward Kentucky, or the great western interests, which she had so prominently supported; and that you had strong apprehensions his administration would be a reign of fury and turbulence. Governor Shelby then remarked, that he concurred entirely in these views, and proceeded to communicate to you what he had never mentioned out of the circle of his immediate family, the great change effected in his mind towards General Jackson, by his conduct at the Chickasaw treaty in 1818; that the high estimation in which he had heretofore regarded the *temper*, the *discretion, judgment*, and *disinterested patriotism* of General Jackson, had been greatly lessened by his conduct on that occasion. He said, his *rash, hot-headed temper*, if it had not been restrained, would have cost the nation double the sum for which the land was ultimately purchased; and he had so permitted the integrity of his principles to be the dupe of an intrigue, as to propose, on behalf of his personal friends then present, to secure for them a reservation of the Big Spring, and a valuable tract of land around it. To this proposition, he, Governor Shelby, opposed an indignant refusal; but at length consented to its partial adoption, with the understanding that the government should have the preemption right, at the price stipulated. He accordingly caused the necessary information to be transmitted to the President, who promptly accepted the reservation on behalf of the government."

I have no hesitation in saying, that the account here given in relation to the transactions of the Chickasaw treaty of 1818, is greatly erroneous. I was present when that treaty was made, and have, perhaps, as accurate a knowledge of what was done, or proposed to be done, as any other person on the ground, not even excepting the commissioners. I feel myself fully authorised in saying that either Governor Shelby's recollection must have entirely failed him, or that his remarks have been incorrectly reported. I have in my possession a duplicate of the secret and confidential Journal of the proceedings of the commissioners, in the hand-writing of their Secretary, Col. Robert Butler, and will extract so much as relates to the proceedings of the "Big Spring" reservation, in order to show that nothing unfair or selfish could have been attempted. The Journal says: "The reservation made by the treaty of September 1816, to George and Levi Colbert, was proposed to be given in *fee simple*,—and that a conveyance would be taken for the same for the benefit of the government, if the Executive chose to accept it; that it should be made to an individual, and placed in my hands, as an *escrow*, until the option of the government was had. The sum proposed for these reservations was, in the first instance $10,000; but would not be heard. The *confidential agent* was then instructed to offer $17,000, which made them listen," &c. The commissioners finally offered them $20,000, which they agreed to take.

When I inform you that the *confidential agent* alluded to in the extract above, was myself, you must be satisfied that no one on the treaty-ground could have had a better opportunity of knowing the nature of the propositions which were submitted or proposed to be submitted to the Colberts, for their reservations: and I do aver, that no other arrangement than the one recorded in the secret Journal was ever proposed, or, so far as I know, ever contemplated by either of the commissioners. It was believed that the *possibility* even, of making a treaty, depended upon the purchase of those reservations. The plan originated with Gen. Jackson, and I believe he communicated his views to me before he consulted Governor Shelby upon the subject. The General observed to me, that the commissioners were not authorised by the government to purchase those reservations; but that he thought it might be done by introducing a clause into the treaty, should one be made, authorising the Indians to sell to an individual, and the government could either sanction it or not, when it should be laid before them for ratification. This arrangement was proposed, not for the purpose of benefitting *personal friends*, "then present," but to enable the commissioners with more certainty to accomplish the objects of the government. The necessity of some such measure was considered by Governor Shelby himself, as indispensable, and he unhesitatingly entered into the views of Gen. Jackson,

I was present when they talked upon the subject; there was no discrepancy in their opinions, no *indignant rejection* of propositions on either side, as I heard; they accorded in their views, and deputed me to wait on the owners of the reservations with the propositions given in the confidential Journal. If any thing selfish, unfair, or improper, was intended by either of the commissioners, I was wholly unapprized of it: and it does seem to me, that none other than a mind deeply tinctured with unwarrantable suspicion, could have conceived such an idea. It is possible, that because the General spoke of having the land conveyed, in the first instance, to an individual, Governor Shelby, before an explanation was made, might have supposed it was designed for the benefit of particular individuals; but I could not have imagined, from what passed between him and the General, in my presence, that such an impression could have remained upon his mind. I have no doubt, (and I *always* so believed,) that both commissioners were actuated, in the transactions of that treaty, from motives of disinterested patriotism. The objects to be accomplished were of vast importance to the States of Tennessee and Kentucky, and they, no doubt, were willing to avail themselves of all fair and honorable means which promised to crown their efforts with success.

But Governor Shelby, according to Mr. Todd, thought General Jackson was induced to propose this arrangement (concerning the reservations) for the benefit of "personal friends *then present*." If the Governor's allusion was to me, as one of the General's friends, he labored under a great mistake; for I had resolved on having nothing to do with it, unless compelled by my responsibility for the payment of the money, in case the government did not think proper to take the land. I did not think the purchase so great a bargain as some others did; I knew, so far from the reservation containing an entire body of *rich land*, that a large proportion of it was poor, and the sum stipulated to be given was at the rate of about one dollar per acre, if my recollection does not deceive me. I did not expect to have any interest whatever in the purchase; nor do I believe a single individual on the ground was in any manner concerned.—Those on whom the General relied to advance the money, in case the government declined taking the land, were absent. The Governor's recollection was certainly very defective in some respects; for he is represented as locating the Colbert reservation around the *Big Spring* and including a body of *valuable land*. Now, I admit that if located at that Spring, it would have included a body of rich and valuable land; but its locality is not within fifteen or twenty miles of it, and includes, comparatively speaking, poor lands. The one is on the south, and the other is on the north side of the Tennessee river.

It appears also, that Governor Shelby is made to find great fault with General Jackson's *temper*. "He said, his *rash, hot-headed temper*, if it had not been restrained, would have cost the nation double the sum for which the land was ultimately purchased." Here, I presume, the Governor does not speak in reference to the *reservation*, but the lands situated in the States of Tennessee and Kentucky. Whether General Jackson evidenced mere *temper* or *rashness* than Governor Shelby himself, in negotiating that treaty, will appear from the following facts and circumstances.

It is true, that some difficulty did arise in the conclusion of the treaty, and that the General and the Governor were both considerably excited for a short time. It must be in reference to that unfortunate disagreement Governor Shelby speaks, when he objects to General Jackson's *temper*. This was an extremely unpleasant occurrence, and the General and his friends have always forborne to speak of it even in their own "immediate families," more on Governor Shelby's account, however, than his. They were willing it should be forgotten, nor would it now be called up and presented to the public, if a member of Governor Shelby's family was not attempting to use it to the prejudice of General Jackson.

That you may the better understand the *cause* of this personal controversy between the commissioners, I will introduce into this letter another extract from the confidential Journal. In answer to a talk made by Levi Colbert, the speaker of the nation, "the commissioners told him they would be liberal, as their Father, the President, had told them to be so. Twenty thousand dollars for twelve years was then proposed by the commissioners, which they sternly refused, remarking, they loved money well, but they loved their land much better. It was then proposed to add one year, which was likewise rejected. General Jackson then observed, to make all hearts straight, he would agree to make the annuity fourteen years, and that he hoped the Chiefs and the nation would consider that a liberal price from their Father the President. Levi Colbert then remarked, they would consider of it, and then adjourned. On meeting again, Colbert enquired if one cent would not be given; and being informed that the commissioners had gone to their limit, he observed that the American nation is as strong as iron—great, rich and strong, and one cent was nothing to it, and this would satisfy the nation. General Jackson replied by asking if one solitary cent would satisfy the nation, and the speaker replied it would, observing that the American nation was strong, and the younger brother must therefore yield to the elder brother; on which they shook hands with the commissioners and parted. In a conversation shortly after, with the interpreter, he said they shook hands on fifteen years annuity, which was not the understanding of the commissioners: and thus the thing rested, until the time arranged for signing the treaty.

"The Chiefs arrived this morning about 11 o'clock, and the commissioners attempted to explain how they mistook the meaning of the speaker about the cent; but they could not, nor would not understand it in any other light than that his meaning was one additional annuity, on which they shook hands, and that they had come prepared to sign the treaty as agreed upon. The commissioners finding from the stern manner in which they viewed an attempt to explain away their understanding of the annuity, deemed it prudent not to jeopardize the grand object for the pittance of $20,0000, to be paid 13 years hence, and accordingly filled up the blank in the treaty with fifteen, and the instrument was then duly and solemnly executed and re-

tested, after being read and explained in the presence of the numerous concourse of their young men."

At the end of this Journal is the following certificate: "Examined and approved."

(Signed) ISAAC SHELBY, } *Com'rs.*
AND. JACKSON, }

The controversy between General Jackson and Governor Shelby grew out of the misunderstanding with regard to the *one cent*. The Indians insisted that they meant by one cent, another annuity, and that no other construction could fairly be put upon their meaning. Governor Shelby *positively* refused to give the additional annuity, and the Indians as positively refused to cede their lands. General Jackson, who, until now, had taken but little part in the controversy, thought the objects to be acquired by the treaty were of too high importance to be lost by the mere pittance of 20,000 dollars, to be paid 15 years from that date, and was willing to give them the fifteen annuites. The Governor still peremptorily refused. The General enquired of him, in the presence of the whole company, if they had not, between themselves, agreed to go as high as three hundred thousand dollars for the country. The Governor said they had, but that he intended that sum to cover also the expenses of holding the treaty. General Jackson replied, that was not his understanding; that he considered the fifteen annuities within the limit prescribed to themselves in their private conference, and that he was disposed to fill up the blank with that number. Gov. Shelby still obstinately refused. The General said he regretted such was his determination; but still he would execute the treaty himself, on the part of the United States, and send it to the government, and they could ratify it or not as they chose. Upon this Gov. Shelby became quite violent, ordered his servant to get his horses, and declared he would leave the treaty-ground. His horses were accordingly brought out and saddled; and, finding that he was resolved on leaving the ground without concluding the treaty, then ready for his signature, I determined, if possible, to remove every obstacle to its final consummation, and, with a view to effect that object, authorised Col. Butler, the Secretary, to speak to Gov. Shelby, and say to him that if the additional annuity was the only objection to the treaty, I would execute to him, or the Executive of the United States, my bond for the $20,000, with any security that might be required, to be paid on condition the government should be unwilling to ratify the treaty for more than fourteen annuities. Col. Butler did wait on Gov. Shelby with my proposition, and received for answer, that the additional annuity was the only objection to the treaty; and, after a few minutes reflection, agreed to accept my proposition. The bond was accordingly executed, deposited in the hands of their Secretary, and the treaty signed by both of the Commissioners. I was induced to propose and enter into this arrangment, as well on account of the State of Tennessee, which was deeply interested in the success of this negotiation with the Chickasaws for their lands, as on my own account, and many of my personal friends, who, as well as myself, were largely interested in lands situated in that section of the State, and held under North Carolina grants, issued, most of them, thirty five years before the treaty was made.

Governor Shelby, when he reflected on the part he had acted at the treaty, became convinced, no doubt, that his conduct had been *hasty*, if not *rash*. This may be inferred from the circumstance of his directing Col. Butler to destroy the bond he had taken for the payment of the last annuity, before he reached Nashville on his return.

As Gen. Jackson's official duties prevented his accompanying the Governor, on their return home, farther than Florence, they parted at that place, in perfect friendship, and the Governor called at the Hermitage, on his way to Kentucky —remained there a day or two with Mrs. Jackson, and left his portrait, taken by Mr. Earle, for the General, which occupies the most conspicuous place in his drawing-room. No one, I will venture to assert, has ever heard General Jackson, since that period, speak of Governor Shelby in any other than terms of kindness and friendship.

I think, sir, every thing considered, that Governor Shelby had but little ground to complain of General Jackson's *temper*. I will not deny but that the General was, for the moment, pretty much excited as well as the Governor; but still he would not permit his *feelings*, for an instant, to divert his mind from the treaty. The objects to be attained by it were of too great importance to the nation, to Tennessee, and to Kentucky, to be abandoned, as he thought, for the mere pittance of $20,000. Besides what would the nation have gained, if the treaty had been broken off in consequence of the commissioners refusing to give the additional annuity? The expences of holding the treaty amounted to nearly $20,000, which would have been a clear loss to the government if no treaty had been made. However, better counsels prevailed; the treaty was made, and a tract of country acquired thereby, that has given to Kentucky *four* new counties, to Tennessee *fourteen* entire counties besides several large fractions of other counties, and to the nation, it will in a few years more give a strong, dense and enterprising population on the banks of the upper Mississippi, capable at a moment's warning of contributing largely to the defence and protection of the lower country, whenever its rights shall be assailed by either a foreign or domestic foe.

The General evinced no disposition to go beyond the sum agreed on as the ultimatum to be given. He had frequently been engaged in making Indian treaties, and in what instance has he given *double* as much as the country acquired was worth? The General was always disposed to give what he thought a fair price for lands purchased of the Indians, dealing justly with them, without manifesting any disposition to lose sight of the interest of his country.

I do not wish, sir, to be understood as casting any imputations upon the veracity of Governor Shelby, with regard to the remarks attributed to him by Mr. Todd. I have no doubt but that the old gentleman stated what were *then* his impressions; but I maintain that he had forgotten the circumstances connected with the purchase of the reservation, or totally misconceived the nature of the propositions submitted by the Commissioners. General Jackson's objection to the

chase the land, and if the government should think the price too high, or refuse to take it, he was willing to take upon himself the responsibility of finding individuals who would take it at the stipulated price: because on this arrangement he believed the ultimate success of the treaty rested. I again *aver*, that I have no knowledge of any other arrangement having been proposed, or *contemplated*, with regard to those reservations, than the one entered into and recorded in the confidential Journal. This averment I feel confident will be sustained by the testimony of Col. Robert Butler, who was present, if I am not mistaken, when the conversation alluded to, took place between the commissioners. With regard to the unfortunate difference between the commissioners at the conclusion of the treaty, about the additional annuity, the circumstances detailed above must be recollected by every person present, to wit: Col. Butler, Gen. Richard Call, Major William Eastin, Capt. David Smith, Major Benjamin Smith, Major Winchester, Mr. Kerr, and many others. Respectfully,

W. B. LEWIS.

From the Virginia Advocate.

JACKSON AND BURR.

In our last we promised this week to take that notice of Judge Williams' statement, which our other engagements then prevented. It is our purpose now to fulfil that pledge.

Most of our readers are already informed that during the session of the Adams Convention in Richmond in January last, a letter purporting to have been written by Judge Nathaniel Williams of Tennessee, to Mr. Kerr of this State, was exhibited, circulated, copied, and much talked of, in which the writer affirmed of his own knowledge that there had existed a criminal connexion between General Jackson and Aaron Burr. Those who have observed with what avidity the friends of the administration seize on every charge against Gen. Jackson, which folly or malignity can invent, in the vain hope that by their clamour against him, they may be able to divert public attention from the corruption and incapacity of those whom they support, will not be surprised to learn that this story improbable as it is, was most favorably received by them. It was not indeed so far distinguished as to be allowed a place in the Address, along with other accusations equally unfounded,—but individual enterprize and partizan zeal were relied on to give it circulation; and they have accomplished the object no less effectually, than if "thirty thousand" impressions of it also, had issued from the same mint, which stamped if it did not coin many similar calumnies. By the adoption of this mode it has too been so circulated, as to preclude all enquiry as to its truth, all exposure of its fallacy. We rejoice that its author has at length ventured from his concealment, though with every advantage which the *averment* of immaterial facts and the *deduction* from them of those he wished to establish—which omission and confusion of dates—and we believe, which change of plot, induced by subsequent developements, may afford him. We are indeed somewhat at a loss to imagine, to what proper cause can be attributed his long silence. As early as February last, he was informed by Gen. Jackson, that the facts understood to have been communicated by him to Mr. Kerr, were untrue and he permits them to remain in private circulation from that time until about the first of this month, without retracting or explaining what he had said, or assuming the responsibility of its truth. Such a course in our opinion cannot be justified or defended. It is directly at war with every principle of fair dealing and honorable opposition. Our business however is with the accuracy of Judge Williams' statement—not the propriety of his conduct—and with the former only shall we now concern ourselves.

Gen. Jackson having been informed by a friend in Virginia of Williams' letter to Kerr, addressed the following communication to him.

(General Jackson to Judge Williams.)

HERMITAGE, Feb. 23, 1828.

SIR—Having received a letter from a high-minded, honorable gentleman of Virginia, who loves *truth*, and *knows how to appreciate character*, I lose no time in laying before you, the postscript of his letter, which is in the following words, to wit:—"It may be well to say, that a letter was handed about at the *Adams Convention*, I hear, accusing you of being concerned in Burr's conspiracy, upon the authority of a Judge Nathaniel Williams of your State. The report is, that this Judge Williams writes, when a young man, he applied to you, then a Judge, to sign his license as a lawyer, that you did so, but recommended to him, as you conceived him to be a man of promise, to push his fortune by joining Burr, *who was then in your house*, promising, if he would do so, to procure for him a commission as a Captain in Burr's army. This story is going the rounds from the Adams Delegates, who have returned home, notwithstanding they ought to know that you was the first person to put Governor Claiborne on his guard against the schemes of Burr. VERBUM SAT."

The records of the country contradict this statement, as it is well known that I resigned my appointment of Judge, before Col. Burr *ever was in the State of Tennessee*. I cannot, then, for one moment, permit myself to believe that you, elevated as you are, to a seat on the judicial bench of Tennessee, could give your authority to such an unfounded falsehood.—Duty to myself, as well as justice to you, therefore, require that I should, without delay, advise you of this libel upon my character, so that you may at once declare whether you are or are not the author of this calumny, before I expose it as such.

I am, and have been, well advised of a secret combination of a *base and wicked few* in Tennessee, whose object is to slander me, but, until *now*, I have never heard, or had the least intimation that you were of that *group*. Nor do I now believe that you, who must be so well satisfied of the falsehood contained in the postscript of the letter referred to above, as well as the rectitude of my conduct since your acquaintance with me, could be so lost to *virtue* and to *truth* as to have originated and put in circulation so base a calumny. With this impression I send J. W. D. S. Donelson to you with this communication, having no doubt, as an honorable man, that you will send me a frank and prompt reply.

(A copy, Signed) ANDREW JACKSON.

The Hon. NATHANIEL WILLIAMS,
Judge of the Circuit Courts of Tennessee.

It will be observed that whilst Gen. Jackson refers to the time of his retirement from the bench to disprove the truth of the *statement* which he was informed had been made, he explicitly denies the truth of the *charge* against himself, independently of the circumstances detailed in connexion with it. He pronounces it a "libel upon" his "character," and a "calumny;"—and says, "nor do I now believe that you who must be so well satisfied of the falsehood contained in the post-script of the letter referred to above, as well as the *rectitude of my conduct since your acquaintance with me*, could be so lost to virtue and to truth as to have originated and put into circulation so base a calumny. A more full and unequivocal denial of the criminality charged charged upon him, as well as the truth of Williams' story, could not well have been framed.

To this letter, Williams makes the following reply:

(Judge Williams' reply to Gen. Jackson.)

Sparta, Feb. 27, 1828.

After copying from Gen Jackson's letter to me, the report as stated in his letter, I wrote as follows:

I can very frankly deny ever having written the letter spoken of by the gentleman wote you from Washington, but I did write a letter to a relation of mine, at that time in Richmond. The letter, if seen, would show that it was designed as a confidential one. I do not at this time recollect accurately what the letter did contain; I believe, though, I can remember a part, if not the whole, of what I intended at the time, and I will state it, as it is but just that what has been by me means privately circulated, should be publicly avowed under the necessities of this case.

Some time after Burr had passed Nashville once or twice, to the lower country, before Mr. Jefferson's proclamation, in riding from Gen. Jackson's house to Nashville, Gen. Jackson, in reference to thatconspiracy, or what was afterwards called by others a conspiracy, said to me, "that I could, if I would accept of it, obtain a commission of captain."

Afterwards, during the sitting of the County Court of Sumner, at ati me when Patton Anderson told me that either Burr or Adair, or both of them, were at Gen. Jackson's house, in a room of a tavern then kept by an Edmund Crutcher, General Jackson said to me—I think Judge Stewart was then in the room—"Take notice, Gentlemen, you will find that a division of the United States has taken deep root; you will find that a number of the Senate, and a number of the members of the House of Representatives are deeply involved in the scheme"

I am not certain that the above was contained in my private letter to Mr. Nathaniel Kerr; but as I have made these statements privately, it is but just that I should now avow them.

I am in hopes, sir, that this letter will be altogether satisfactory to you, for, Gen. Jackson may be assured (the Presidential question aside) no man can feel more bound to Gen. Jackson than myself, for the great honor conferred by him on my country.

NATH. W. WILLIAMS.

(Copy.)

Gen. Andrew Jackson.

This letter whilst it was so prepared as to avoid asserting directly or by necessary inference, that the writer had not informed his correspondent, that his conversation with General Jackson took place on his applying to the latter to examine him for a license, is manifestly so worded as to convey that impression to those who read it. The letter to Kerr, we have never seen. But we have heard it spoken of by many—as well in Richmond when it was first exhibited, as elsewhere since—by some who had seen it, and some who had not—and up to the time of Judge Williams' publication, we had always heard its purport represented in the same manner, and to the best of our recollection, the conversation uniformly described as having taken place at Gen. Jackson's house on Williams' applying to him for a license. Now, Judge Williams *seems to deny* that such was his statement, and we are told by those who sustain and profess to believe him, that his letter did not contain it. If gentlemen who have seen that letter make that assertion, we cannot disbelieve them. But then the inquiry immediately presents itself, how did it happen that an avowed "conjecture" of Mr. Kerr's (for such we are now informed from several sources, was its character) came to be represented by the very gentlemen who heard it, in the very place that it was expressed, and we imagine on the very day of its utterance, as the solemn affirmation of Judge Williams; and has been so repeated and circulated for six months. What are we to think of a party who if their explanation be true, convert "conjecture" into proof—circulate it as evidence establishing a criminal charge against him whom they oppose, and are length induced to confess its real nature, not from any lingering sense of justice, but to skreen the character of their witness? The defence may possibly avail Williams—it assuredly deeply criminates others. If however those concerned be ambitious of the honor which such an explanation unavoidably confers on them, it becomes not us to dispute their title to it. But we will endeavor to show that though they claim and enjoy it, Williams is not necessarily innocent of having made the statement, which they would now disclaim for him.

It must be admitted to be extremely improbable that Mr. Kerr should have hazarded a conjecture of that sort at all, unless he has received information authorizing it from Williams—for from no other source could it have been derived. How could he have known that Williams had ever been examined by Gen. Jackson—or if he knew this only, what could have induced him of his own mere pleasure, without either knowing the fact or having any sufficient reason to presume it, to state even as a conjecture, that the conversation occurred at Jackson's house on his being applied to by Williams for his license. Why not have conjectured that it took place at Nashville, or at some Court, or at the memorable ball which Burr attended? Such conjectures would have been more probably correct, because at the latter places, it might have been reasonably supposed that Gen. Jackson and Williams had met. And if it be improbable that Kerr should, in mere wantonness, have hazarded as conjectural only, the statement ascribed to him—how much more so is it, that he should have made it, not as a surmise of

his own, but as derived from Williams himself, if in fact he had no authority for the representation? That he did make it in such a manner as to induce that impression we have heard from unquestionable authority; and indeed the act of his party in circulating it as a part of the testimony of Williams, should at least satisfiy themselves that he was generally so understood.—When in addition, it is known, as we have been informed was the case, that Mr. Kerr had seen Judge Williams within a short time previous to the receipt of his letter in January, it cannot we think be doubted, that his statements—now alleged to have been his conjectures—were made on the authority of Williams, whether contained in his letter or not. It is the only pesumption warranted by the facts—the only one which can be indulged consistently with the character and integrity of Mr. Kerr and his party.

Assuming, then, as we may fairly do, that the alleged conjecture of Kerr was in truth the statement of Williams himself, it follows as a necessary consequence, that the inconsistency—the contradiction between his first and subsequent representations, render both utterly unworthy of confidence. We do not pretend to assert—no man in his senses can—that the character of any communication made by Gen. Jackson to Williams was at all affected by the *place* of it. If it was criminal at his house on Williams' going to be examined by him, it would have been equally so, if made at the same time, on the road to Nashville or elsewhere. But considered in relation to the credit of the witness, we beg to know what faith can be reposed in his testimony, who at one time locates a criminal charge at one place, and then at another—who first details certain circumstances as attending the act, and when the *falsehood of those circumstances is exposed beyond all question*, substitutes others in their stead? The criminality of a felon is in no manner dependent on the precise spot on which the offence was perpetrated. It can, however, scarcely be questioned, that were a witness for a prosecution to testify at one time to its having been committed at a certain place, under certain circumstances, and afterwards to say that it was committed at another, and connected with different incidents, his testimony would and ought to be wholly disregarded, for this very good reason—he must have spoken ignorantly or falsely, either on one occasion or the other, and we can have no assurance that he has been better informed as to facts, or more observant of truth, on other and more material points. This principle, sanctioned by the law of all civilized countries, and the feelings and common sense of every intelligent human being, would, in a case of similar inconsistency on the part of the witness against him, protect the veriest wretch who was ever dragged to the bar of justice, loaded with ignominy and suspicion. May we not then claim its benefit in behalf of an illustrious man, charged with a crime, against which the integrity of a long and useful life, "trumpet-tongued" defend him.

Of the witness in this case, we know nothing personally—we do not even know, though we have the best reason to believe it, that he has involved himself in the contradiction which, if it exists, we say should discredit him. Of his motives too, we have no knowledge: he may have been excited by malignity, or have been deceived by the forgetfulness of age. But the objection we have urged to the authority of his testimony, we are persuaded cannot be controverted.

But waiving it—putting out of view that he once asserted as we have attempted to show, that the conversation referred to with General Jackson occurred at the house of the latter on his applying to him for his license, and now, since it has been clearly established that at that time General Jackson was no Judge and therefore could not have been applied to for any such purpose, that it occurred during a casual ride to Nashville—admitting that the error contained in his representation to Kerr, shall not affect the statements in his letter to General Jackson.—and that they are true—What do they prove? We confidently answer nothing in the slightest degree implicating Gen. Jackson's character.

The letter of Williams to Gen. Jackson, contains but two averments—first that Gen. Jackson, speaking in reference to Burr's expedition, said to him, that he "could, if he would accept it, obtain a Commission of Captain:" and secondly, that General Jackson subsequently remarked to him, "Take notice, gentlemen, you will find that a division of the U. States has taken deep root," &c. Granting these observations to have been correctly understood and reported, which, bearing in mind that Williams was unable to recollect what he had written to Kerr but two months before, is at least doubtful—it may be easily shown that their character, and of course their susceptibility of being construed into the evidence of guilt, depend entirely on their respective dates.

It is well known that for a considerable time after Burr had indicated his intention of engaging in a Southern expedition—after indeed he had notoriously commenced his preparations, his real object was not suspected, but was suppressed by almost every one, only to extend to an incursion upon, or a settlement in the Spanish territory—a project in which it was generally believed, he was, if not encouraged, at least not opposed by his own government. Under this impression, many most patriotic and respectable men joined him; and many more associated with him, and paid him the respect due to high standing, without the slightest suspicion of his treasonable intentions. It was indeed a considerable time before his real designs became known. The station which he had but recently occupied in the government, his character, and his address, all conspired to create and to continue the deception. Gen. Jackson along with others was deceived: how he at length became aware of his real designs, we shall hereafter have occasion to show.

If we be correct in this view of the subject, or rather in this historical detail, nothing more can be necessary to satisfy the minds of the most prejudiced, that as we asserted, the construction to be placed on these imputed remarks of Gen. Jackson, must depend entirely on the time when they occurred. If the first was expressed before he became undeceived, and the latter afterwards, then all must admit that they prove nothing to his prejudice. It is only by assuming that the alleged offer of the captaincy took place after Gen. Jackson became acquainted with Burr's designs to sever the Union—in

other words, by connecting his two observations, that his guilt is inferred. We have as much reason to say, as we conscientiously believe, that at the time of the first remark, Burr's true object was unknown to Gen. Jackson; and as these remarks are adduced in support of the charge, it is clearly incumbent on those who rely on them, to prove that they occurred at the times assumed by them, otherwise they afford no evidence in their favor. No such proof has been offered, and therefore, we have the right to conclude, in the absence of all proof on the subject, that they occurred at the times we believe them to have taken place, and when they were entirely innocent. But we will go farther, and express the opinion that Williams's own statement, if it does not prove, at least clearly indicates that these remarks were made at the times supposed by us. As to the first, he expressly says, it was "*before Mr. Jefferson's proclamation,*" and that it was in relation to what was "*afterwards called 'a conspiracy.*" If at the time of its occurrence, neither government nor individuals were apprised of Burr's designs—if rumor even had not called his scheme a "conspiracy," we are utterly unable to perceive how Gen. Jackson can be presumed to have penetrated his object, and upon this violent presumption be held responsible for an observation, which, at that time, any other man in the nation might have innocently made. As to the last remark ascribed to Gen. Jackson, Williams admits it was "*afterwards,*" that is, after the first; and therefore even if it be conceded that it was made, it assuredly cannot be connected with the first. If, as must have been the case, it occurred after he became acquainted with Burr's object, it shows that he was the first man to proclaim his designs and warn his friends against them.

This letter, then, admitting every word of it to be true, does not criminate Gen. Jackson, in the slightest degree. In the language of Williams, it could not have been otherwise than "altogether satisfactory" to the General, (so far at least as it implicated his character,) though he may not have been satisfied as to the accuracy of its statements.*

Of this, Williams and his instigators were well aware. For when after a lapse of four or five months it was determined to revive the calumny contained in his letter to Kerr, and to publish it to the world, in the hope no doubt of being able to affect by it the approaching election in Kentucky,—we find them not content with republishing his letter to Gen. Jackson, and relying upon the evidence which it affords; but the following statement accompanies it.

"Under the belief that it is my duty to make the following statement, I make it. I moved to Nashville, Tennessee, from the County of Pittsylvania, Virginia, in the fall of the year 1804, at the age of twenty five, that is, I moved from Virginia, in 1803, to Hawkins Court-House, East Tennessee, and from there I moved to Nashville. In 1806 or '7, these Burr matters transpired. I before protesting against the proceedings of Burr, had been frequently employed in Gen. Jackson's collecting business and other suits. I think in the spring or fall of 1806, in riding from the General's house to Nashville, near the Clover Bottom, he spoke to me in relation to the Commission in Burr's army. And in the same year, at Gallatin, he made the declaration in relation to the division of the Union, as stated in our correspondence. I not only then determined that I would not agree to what I believed to be Burr's schemes, but that I would oppose him as far as I could. Either before or after Mr. Jefferson's proclamation, it was, as I thought, intended to impress the public mind with the belief that a ball then on hand in Nashville, was intended as a mark of respect to Col. Burr. A number of gentlemen in Nashville, to destroy this impression, and to shew their disapprobation of Burr, determined that Col. Burr should not attend the ball, and so informed Colonel Burr through Judge John Overton, who returned with the information, as he told me, from Burr, that Col. Burr had declined coming to the ball.—With this we were satisfied. About the time the ball was half over, I was standing against the wall, opposite the door of entrance in the room, and saw Gen. Jackson lead Burr by the arm into the room, and introduce him, with considerable form, to the ladies and gentlemen then present. I do not recollect at this time, that Mr. Jefferson's proclamation had any effect on the persons then about Nashville, who were, from their conduct, justly liable to our suspicions, and I think, I took some pains to enquire into that circumstance.—Some time afterwards, our party; to show their further indignation, burnt Burr publicly in effigy; I have always believed that during this Burr matter, that Major Tilman Dixon informed me, by letter, that Gen. Coffee had been engaged in procuring boats and provisions for Burr on Cumberland river, though the letter, if there was one, I cannot now find, and I have examined for it. It was my understanding at the time, that Col. Stokely D. Hays went off as one of Burr's men in his boats, and I have never heard it disputed since. Col. Hays is a nephew of Mrs. Jackson. Although I never was at Gen. Jackson's house with Burr, yet I am tolerably well satisfied according to my own recollection at this time of occurrences then, that in the of 1806, and winter of 1807, Burr, and Gen. Jackson were very intimate; and that Burr was frequently at the General's house.

* We have been informed that for many years after Burr's conspiracy, Judge Williams remained intimate with Gen. Jackson. He could not, therefore, himself, have believed in the charge which he now makes.

It is asserted by the Knoxville Enquirer that Judge Williams, a few days after Jackson had offered him a captaincy in Burr's army, wrote to his relation, Col. John Williams, communicating the fact. But Col. Williams, in a late circular, speaking of the suspicions which once prevailed that Jackson had been engaged with Burr, says that, for his part, he "acted on the principle which shall always govern" his "conduct, of condemning no individual *upon rumor,* and *without testimony;*" and therefore disregard the suspicions. And yet, if the Enquirer, the organ of Judge Williams, speaks truth, Col. Williams was informed of the fact which is now relied on as evidence of General Jackson's guilt, in a few days after its occurrence.

A charge not believed by its author or his relation, who is said to be his instigator also, can scarcely be believed by any one else.

The above is a statement of the most prominent facts as they are fixed on my recollection. If I am mistaken about any thing, it is about dates, and about them I do not pretend to accuracy.

NATH. W. WILLIAMS.

A list of the gentelmen in the ballroom at the time, and who were present on the public square at Nashville, when Burr was burnt in effigy as well as now recollected.

Geo. W. L. Marr, Attorney at Law,

Wm. Smith, Attorney at Law, and now Clerk of the Circuit Court, of Williamson county,

Thos. Swan, of Virginia, Attorney at Law, (dead.)

Doctor Watkins, of East Tenn.

John G. Blount, of N. C.

Judge Porter, of Louisiana,

N. Tunstall, of Pittsylvania County, Va.

E. S. Hall.

Curry, former Postmaster at Nashville.

I am not certain that the gentleman referred to were present; if not they can say; the greater part I am pretty confident were present. I very well know there were at the burning of the effigy from one to two hundred individuals.

N. W. WILLIAMS."*

The only new allegation of importance contained in this expose, relates to the attendance by Burr of a ball in Nashville. The others had been made before, or are now made with so little certainty and precision both as to dates and facts, as not to merit or admit of refutation.—And in regard to it, we are so fortunate as to have the evidence of a gentleman present at that ball, which proves beyond all question that Williams' statement on this subject is untrue. The gentleman to whom we refer, is Dr. Thos. G. Watkins of East Tennessee, one of those named by Williams himself as present on the occasion referred to. Dr. Watkins during a visit to Virginia last Spring, having detailed to one of the editors of this paper the facts connected with Burr's going to this ball, was requested by him to commit them to writing; and in compliance with this request, addressed to him the following letter:

CHARLOTTESVILLE, May 14, 1828.

DEAR SIR—In the winter of 1806 or '7, to the best of my recollection as to the time, I was a member of the dancing assemblies, for the season, in Nashville. On one of the evenings preceding a stated meeting for the night, it was communicated to the managers for the season, two of whom I distinctly recollect, were the present John Overton, L. L. D. of Traveller's Rest, near Nashville, and the late Doctor Hanson Catlett—that Col. Burr was in town. He was immediately ticketed, as Judge Overton informed me, *nem. con.* I think by the managers. Some one, I do not now recollect who, objected to this act of the managers. Judge Overton remarked that he had concurred in the invitation, from a conviction of its propriety—but, as he acted upon delegated authority, he wished a meeting, as full and general as practicable, of the subscribers to the assemblies, to be convened; and if a majority of them disapproved of the act of the managers, the invitation to Mr. Burr should be promptly withdrawn. A meeting, a very full meeting was called, and a majority sanctioned the act of the managers. The ball went on very harmoniously; Col. Burr, though somewhat distrusted by some, was considered an elegant acquisition to it—and was treated accordingly; a hospitable, and gracious smile from the ladies, in return for his very genteel, and very elegant salutations, proved their happy acquiesence, in the general arrangement. General Jackson resided about fourteen miles from Nashville at the time: if he and his amiable lady attended on that occasion as they often did on others—I have lost all distinct recollection of it, which, I think I should not, if there had been any thing more marked in the attention of either to Col. Burr, than seemed to be generally awarded to him by the company present. While on this subject I will remark, that, sometime previous to this Ball, a young gentleman who resided in my family in Nashville, appeared anxious to go with Col. Burr—he afterwards cooled off. And questioned on the subject, by myself or some one in my presence, he stated that a Mr. Caffrey, I think was the name, had been about that time advised—verbally or by a letter, I am not certain which—by Gen. Jackson, to have nothing to do with Col. Burr's expedition.

Respectfully, TH. G. WATKINS.

It is thus clearly shown that Burr was invited to the ball—that his invitation was not recalled, but sanctioned by the subscribers,—and therefore all assertions of insinuations that he was introduced by Gen. Jackson against the consent of the gentlemen attending, are without the shadow of a foundation. From the statement of Dr. Watkins, it is also extremely improbable that Gen. Jackson, if present at all, showed to Burr more attention than is usually paid to a distinguished stranger, to whose prejudice, nothing *is known*; the assertion of Williams to the contrary notwithstanding, who, if his memory be as bad as when it suits his purposes, he chooses to represent it, may well have been standing on his head in a corner, for aught he now knows to the contrary, instead of on his feet "against the wall opposite the door."

The statements of Williams—the witness so much relied on by the Coalition—having been disposed of,—it only remainr for us to offer a few remarks upon the charge itself, and refer

---

*This man has more recently addressed another communication to the public. As, however, it contains no new *fact*, but is rather a silly *argument* in support of his charge, we shall not encumber our columns with his trash. Accompanying it, is a letter from a Mr. John Hoover, who states among other similar reasons for believing the charge, that the standing of Jackson was at that time at so low an ebb, that he probably supposed he had nothing to loose, and therefore might readily have engaged in such a scheme. We should suppose this fellow has no character to loose, or he certainly would not have stated so absurd a falsehood. It is well known that General Jackson in his youth, was the Attorney General of his State, afterwards a member of either House of Congress—had resigned recently a Judgship—and was then, as he has always been, one of the most popular men in the State. Yet this Mr. John Hoover, whom no one ever heard of, testifies that his standing in life was then desperate. It woul be difficult to say, whether this man displays most folly or malignity.

to and exhibit such evidence in disproof of it, as, in our opinion, conclusively shows its falsehood.

The letter written by Gen. Jackson to Mr. Claiborne, Governor of Louisiana on the 12th Nov. 1806, is already before the public. In it he says, "Be upon the alert, keep a watchful eye upon our General, and *beware of an attack as well from our own country*, as Spain. I fear there is something rotten in the state of Denmark. You have enemies within your own city, that may try to subvert your government, and try to separate it from the Union. You know I never hazard ideas without good grounds—you will keep these hints to yourself. But I say again, be upon the alert; your government is in danger. *I fear there are plans on foot inimical to the Union*, whether they will be attempted to be carried into effect or not I cannot say: but rest assured they are in operation, or I calculate boldly;" and again in the same—"I will die in the last ditch before I would see the Union disunited."—In addition to this warning to Gov. Claiborne, given doubtless as soon as he became convinced of Burr's intentions, it is also known, that about the same time, (suspicions then beginning very generally to prevail,) many revolutionary officers in Tennessee of great respectability—men who from their situations may be presumed to have known Jackson intimately, and from their character cannot be suspected of having participated in any treasonable designs—made a formal tender to him as their commander, of their services in support of "the laws and constituted authorities" of the country.

Mr. Jefferson who was President at the time and who is known to have been early informed of Burr's designs, of all his preparations, and of his associates, may be presumed to have had better means of ascertaining whether General Jackson was connected with him, than any one else. His opinion therefore, from the mere circumstance that he possessed this knowledge, and apart from that deference which might be claimed for his judgment, is deserving of particular attention. What that opinion was, is well known. As early as the third of January, 1827, he said in a letter to General Wilkinson, "Be assured that Tennessee, *and particularly General Jackson*, are FAITHFUL." This opinion underwent no change. For to a gentleman whom we know to have been high in his estimation, and to have had many long and unreserved conversations with him on the politics and political history of our country, he remarked only a few years before his death—"You may depend upon it, Sir, that I had at the time of that transaction the most satisfactory evidences of the vigilance, patriotism and integrity of General Jackson on that occasion."

This observation evidently pointed to some communications from the Western country—among them, probably to one from Jackson himself. Accordingly, having ascertained the existence among Mr. Jefferson's papers of a letter from this ever ready patriot, written at the close of 1806; we applied to Mr. Jefferson's executor for a copy thereof. It has been communicated* and will be found to be of a piece with the rest of the great citizen-soldier's life. In the man who in 1806, in a sparsely settled country, pledged himself to bring into the field at twenty days' notice three regiments of volunteers; we recognize the same Andrew Jackson who, in 1817, has established such a character for energy and devotion to the public weal, as to be appealed to by the Federal Executive to lead his fellow-citizens into the Indian country, and "terminate the conflict" which was desolating the frontiers.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

SIR:—In the event of insult or aggression made on our government and country FROM ANY QUARTER, I am so well convinced that the public sentiment and feeling of the citizens within this state, and particularly within my division, are such, of such a nature and such a kind, that I take the liberty of tendering their services—that is, under my command:—and at one moment's warning, after your signification that this tender is acceptable, my orders shall be given conformably.

I beg leave to offer to your view the enclosed orders some time ago issued by me: since which time I have not been furnished with complete returns of the volunteer companies;

---

*At the same time was received the following letter from Mr. Randolph—

EDGEHILL, July 31, 1828.

DEAR SIR,—In answer to yours of the 29th, requesting a copy of a letter written by Gen. Jackson to Mr. Jefferson in the winter of 1806—I had some doubts as to the propriety of sending it; but from its being intended to be used to remove injurious suspicions against Gen. Jackson, I have concluded on complying with your request.

The papers of Mr. Jefferson having passed into my hands, it is my duty to preserve, as sacred and inviolate as he himself would have done, the confidence of his private correspondence. I have been the more sensible of the propriety of this, from the manner in which his private conversations have been misconceived and repeated, and his private letters divulged; as painful to his friends, as it has been cruelly unjust to him. All who knew him, know how entirely averse he was,—having himself retired from the arena,—to an expression of opinion concerning the fitness or unfitness of any of the actors then upon the stage; declaring his own incompetency to decide upon that which was the business of younger heads and more active minds, conversant with the scenes and circumstances under which they played their parts. This is fully proved by the perfect doubt existing amongst his most intimate and confidential friends, as to the object of his preference: each thinking his own peculiar favorite the one approved by him.

I have been prompted to this digression, from the deep mortification which has been inflicted upon the family of Mr. Jefferson, by the manner in which he has been placed without the pale of the common decencies of society, in the violation of his confidence, by the publication of his confidential letters, and divulging his private and unguarded conversations so liable, without the least improper design, to misconception and consequent misstatement.

Very sincerely, your's,

TH. JEFFERSON RANDOLPH.

J. A. G. DAVIS, Esq.

out from the information I possess, I have no doubt that three regiments of volunteers (to be commanded by their own officers, and such as may be recommended by their General) can be brought into the field, ready to march in twenty days from the receipt of orders.

Accept assurances for my high consideration and respect, ANDREW JACKSON.

M. G. 2d Division, Tennessee.

[This letter is without date. It is endersed however, in Mr. Jefferson's hand writing and invariable manner: "Jackson, Genl. And. Tennessee, recd. Nov. 24, 06." The important words "from any quarter," we have set in small capitals, for the purpose of drawing to them the especial attention which they merit.]

Our columns are already too crowded with this matter, to admit at full length the "orders" referred to in this letter. They also, however, contain a deeply significant passage. After calling the attention to the "late conduct of the Spanish Government, added to the hostile appearance and menacing attitude of their armed forces" as making it "necessary that the Militia under his command should be in complete order and at a moments warning ready to march," and impressing the truth "that our good *materials, our best of men* must be properly disciplined; and in this way, the preperation cannot be too great to meet the wishes of the General, and the exigencies of our country,—he addresses his officers as follows: "You are therefore ordered, without delay, to place your brigade on the most respectable footing, and be in readiness to furnish the quota required of you at the shortest notice. All volunteer companies well equipped will be accepted. If the full quota can be raised by voluntary enlistment, it will answer government a better purpose than by pressing men from their families by draft; but if it be discovered that this cannot be done, you will direct that the effective men be classed and that the law in this respect be particularly attended to; and when the GOVERNMENT AND CONSTITUTED AUTHORITIES of our country require, they must be in readiness to march."

If after this exposition, any doubt still remains, which we cannot believe possible, it must be dissipated, even with the most determined and inveterate of Gen. Jackson's maligners, by the evidence which we will now proceed to exhibit. In March last, J. Baker, Esq. of St. Martinsville, Louisiana, visited this neighborhood. In a conversation with two of us, in relation to Gen. Jackson, and the various charges against him, he communicated to us information on the subject of the particular one under consideration, which we deemed important. At our request, he addressed to one of us a letter, repeating the statement which he had verbally made, and which we now publish. Mr. Baker has been long and intimately known to one of the Editors of this paper, and he hesitates not to affirm, that no man is more respectable, or maintains a more unimpeached and unimpeachable character for veracity and honor. Where he is known, no testimonial of his respectability is necessary, and no doubt will be entertained of the correctness of his statement. Mr. Caffrey, to whom he refers, is, we are assured by him, a gentleman of high standing and great respectability. Though we do not regard that Mr. Baker's statement would be admissible, as strictly legal evidence, it cannot fail to carry conviction to every mind, not impervious to the light of truth.

April 8th, 1828.

DEAR SIR,—You request me to send you the statement in writing I made at Mr. G . . . . about the Burr affair. It has been so long since Donelson Caffrey, Esq of St. Mary's, Louisiana made the same to me, that I cannot give the dates of the different transactions, nor the time when I had the conversation with him, but think it was about the time of the last Presidential election. I did not treasure up the facts and dates that Mr. C. communicated to me, because I did not then think, nor do I now think that any such proof was necessary to repel the idea of Gen. Jackson's having had any thing to do with Burr's conspiracy. Those who know Gen. J. could not for one moment suppose him to have been in any way engaged with Burr and his acts of a public character show too much patriotism for any one to believe such a fabrication at this day. Mr. Caffrey's communication was substantially as follows:—Burr visited Tennessee, staid some time at Nashville and was often to see Gen. Jackson. A friend of Burr went to see Gen. J. and while in familiar conversation with him, asked him what he would think of the man who had the talents and means to seperate the Western States from the Eastern, and make the mountain the dividing line. The General replied that he would consider him a traitor to his country, and would be one of the first to take his life. Here the conversation ended. This friend of Burr returned to Nashville, where Burr then was, and no doubt communicated to him Gen. Jackson's answer to this oblique question. This conversation awakened Gen. Jackson's suspicions, for he wrote to Gov. Clairborne, putting him upon his guard against Burr. Clairborne was then Governor of the territory of Mississippi. Gen. J. also recalled from the service of Burr all his young relatives who had been induced to join Burr under the belief that he was going to revolutionize the Spaish dominions in North America. Mr. Caffrey was one of them. I think (though I will not be positive,) that Mr. C. showed me Gen. J's letter to him, advising him to abandon Burr.

Your friend, JOSHUA BAKER.

In this letter we are persuaded, is contained the true explanation of Gen. Jackson's alleged connexion with Burr, and the reasons which first induced him to suspect his designs. Immediately on discovering them, though he was not authorized by what had passed, publicly to proclaim Burr a traitor, he recalled his nephew from his service, wrote to Claiborne putting him on his guard, and to the President, making a tender of his services to the government.

We have, we trust, redeemed the pledge we gave to refute this foul calumny whenever its authors and abettors dared to produced the evidence of which they boasted the possession. In In performing this task, we have been reluctantly led into greater prolixity than was desirable or perhaps necessary. The very weakness of the case which we had to oppose, presenting no one strong point to be assailed, and the imperfect and conclusive nature of the evidence on which it rests, consisting of vague rumors, malicious conjectures, and unfounded inferen-

ces, in a great degree exposed us to this inconvenience. But after undertaking the examination, we desired to peruse it effectually and thoroughly; though we were satisfied that a formal refutation of the charge was not necessary to the vindication of Gen. Jackson's character. He may have been occasionslly impelled by the warmth of his temperament and the peculiar circumstances of his situation, to acts, which to those who scan his conduct with harshness rather than justice, may seem to have partaken of rashness and excess; he may in his zeal to serve his country, sometimes have overstepped the limits of his authority;—these are questions about which honest and intelligent men may well differ. But when an attempt is made by that party and those acting with them, who have always opposed the Government unless when it was administered by themselves, who preferred a dissolution of the Union to sustaining the burthens and encountering the perils incident to a state of war, who have uniformly "sunk as their country rose, and rose as that desponding, lacerated, perishing, betrayed country sunk,"—to prove TREASON on him who was an able and efficient member of the republican party in '98, who largely contributed to win his valor the honorable peace which they would have purchased with national disgrace, who has been a consistent patriot from his boyhood, and an honest and honorable man through life—the American people cannot require the formality of a defence, to acquit him from such a charge. It does in truth no less insult their understandings, than foully, basely calumniate one of their greatest benefactors.

From the Argus of Western America.

SUMMARY OF FACTS.

From the conduct of the advocates of John Q. Adams, it is apparent that they do not rely for success on his merit of the acts of his administration. Of the well founded objections to him, both on the score of principle and conduct, originating as well before as since his accession to the Presidency, they scarcely deign to take any notice; but answer every new discovery of private delinquency and public abuse with some new charge against General Jackson. By this course of conduct, they conclusively prove, that the present men in power are wholly indefensible, and that their only hope consists in rendering Gen. Jackson still more obnoxious than they are.

They do not attempt to show that Mr. Adams was not raised in the principles of his father, an aristocrat and monarchist, who believed that there ought to be, and always would be, distinctions in society, and that the British system of King, Lords and Commons, is "the noblest work of human invention," the admiration of the world."

They cannot pretend that he was not the reviler of Jefferson, the foe of democracy, and one of the leaders of the New-England federalists, until the latter part of 1807.

They do not deny that he *secretly* denounced the federal party to Mr. Giles and Mr. Jefferson, as traitors to their country while he was publicly seeking to retain their friendship.

The Journals show beyond contradiction, that he voted against an amendment of the constitution in relation to the election of President and Vice-President, after having learnt, by the contest between Jefferson and Burr, that it was fatally defective.

The same evidence, united with his vindication in 1812, proves that he voted against annexing Louisiana to the United States, and considered it wholly unconstitutional.

We have the authority of Mr. Clay, David Trimble, Ben. Hardin, &c. &c. for saying that at Ghent he displayed his hostility to the West, in attempting to barter to the British the free navigation of the Mississippi.

We have the authority of Mr. Clay and his friends, for saying, that he gave up Texas to Spain without necessity or equivalent, the Spanish minister being instructed to concede it to us.

During the last Presidential contest David Trimble, the Reporter, and all Mr. Clay's friends and advocates in this country, represented Mr. Adams as an apostate federalist, a political hypocrite, an enemy of the West, undeserving of public honors and unfit for public stations.

Developments since made, prove, that on the Ghent mission, while our country was bleeding, our treasury was empty and our army starving, he was charging for outfits, salaries, contingencies and journeys never performed, a greater sum per annum than the salary of the President, and pevishly complaining of our government as "feeble and penurious," because Congress somewhat obstructed cupidity and avarice.

It is admitted, even by his friends, that after his return home, the books of the Treasury were falsified, to enable him to pocket a considerable sum, to which he was not entitled by law, and it is impossible that it could have been done without his knowledge or connivance.

When made Secretary of State, he took the printing of the Acts of Congress in Massachusetts from a republican paper which had supported the country in peace and in war, and gave it to Ben. Russell of the Boston Centinel, the leading advocate of the Hartford Convention and disunion.

He was made President by a double bargain. The federalists hated him because he had betrayed and abandoned them; but, to secure their votes, traitors as he had declared them to be, he gave a written pledge, as one of them has acknowledged, to appoint them to offices—The western members hated him as the enemy of their section of the Union; yet he got their votes, because it was "distinctly ascertained that he would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State."

By this buying up eastern traitors and the representatives of western patriots, he was made President according to the form of the constitution, but in gross violation of the will of the people. By the union of those two extremes, old maxims have been discarded, and old principles recanted; dangerous examples have become "safe precedents," and the Secretary succession, which "it was the first object of Mr. Clay's friends to prevent," has now become the first object of their desires; it is to furnish a convenient substitute for hereditary succession, and like imperial Rome, we are to have our line of Cæsars, each appointing his successors.

When a Senator dared to arraign this unnatural union in debate, Mr. Adams suffered his

prime minister and appointed successor to call him to the field and attempt to shoot him to death.

By the terror of the pistol, by the influence of official station, by the power and patronage of the government, have Mr. Adams and his Secretary attempted to make themselves popular.

A billiard table was purchased and set up, and is now standing in the President's house, when most of the States have suppressed the game, from its immorality.

Printers were proscribed and deprived of public patronage, solely because they dared to raise their voices against the principles of the election and the acts of the administration, and the patronage of the government is avowedly bestowed only on those who support the men in power.

A salary was paid to a friend of Mr. Clay, as Secretary of the Panama mission, for several months, while he was electioneering for the office of Governor of New-York.

The ill judged project of a mission of Panama, cost the life of our valued fellow-citizen, Richard C. Anderson, and about $80,000 in outfits, salaries, contingences and the equipments of a public ship, without yielding the slightest return in profit or in honor.

The superannuated Rufus King was sent to England, and left without instructions as to the British colonial trade; and having pocketed an outfit of $9,000 and a salary of about $9,000, returned home and left his son in charge of the papers to whom was paid over $5,000 for that service, about sixty days, contrary to all law and in defiance of all justice.

Albert Gallatin was then sent to the same post; and having pocketed an outfit of $9,000 and a salary of $9,000, he also returned home.

The British offered us their colonial trade on terms which Mr. Adams rejected; afterwards changing his mind, he offered the same terms to them; they also had changed their minds, and deprived us of the trade altogether.

For a long time while our relations with that government were of so serious a nature as to require of the President to order troops to the frontiers of Maine to check British encroachments, we were left wholly unrepresented at that Court!

At last James Barbour is sent out as our minister, with his outfit of $9,000, who will doubtless return in one year, having pocketed a salary of $9,000, while $4,500 will doubtless be paid the present Charge des Affairs for his outfit: making the outfits of that mission for four years, no less that $30,000.

By neglect, the French colonial trade has been lost.

The independent State of Georgia has been threatened with millitary punishment, for daring to survey her own territory.

The Secretaries, Heads of the several Departments, almost periodically, quit their public duties, range through the country, making speeches and electioneering to keep their master in office, in the face of all propriety, of all decency, contrary to the practice of all former times and the instructions given by the revered Jefferson.

Documents from public officers have been so disarranged when laid before Congress as to produce false impressions, while some of the most important have been suppressed, and as well the papers as the money of the people prostituted to the vilest electioneering.

The public money has been literally lavished on partisans and favorites, and ingenuity seems to have been taxed to devise ways and means to extract it from the Treasury.

John H. Pleasants, editor of the Richmond Whig, was paid $1,940 for carrying depatches to Buenos Ayres, when the Government knew, that instead of going there, he sent his papers by another hand, and went on a trip of pleasure to England.

Theodore W. Clay, son of the Secretary of State, was paid $1,205 for carrying despatches to Mexico.

These and many other messengers were allowed six dollars per day, besides the payment of enormous bills for their expenses, making it amount in some instances, to sixteen dollars per day, when an honest man as ever bore a letter, could have been hired for two dollars and their *actual* expenses.

Messengers have been even hired to carry despatches to New-York and Norfolk, where the public mails run as swiftly as any messenger can go, and would carry despatches as safely.

In the Department of State alone, $15,000 has been paid for extra Clerk hire, in addition to the salaries of a host of regular Clerks, some of them have received considerable sums for alleged extra work; many thousands, in purchasing all sorts of books, few of which are in use in the duties of the Department; thousands for medals and pictures of distinguished men—of the President and Indians; more than $4,000 for boarding Indians in the most extravagant of the City Hotels, hundreds for *English writing paper* with the crown stamped on it; extravagant prices for Port Folios, and every sort of finery and foolery, not for the people's use, but to gratify the extravagancies of officers and clerks; more than $1,300 for buying, keeping, recovering, &c. of horses and their trappings; various items for cleaning grass out of the pavement of the Secretary's office, and pouring hot ley on it; and $215 for cleaning boots and shoes for Indians!

Old Hezekiah Niles has been paid a $1,000 for subscription to his newspaper!

By these and many other extravagancies and fooleries, the expenses of the government have been increased during the last three years *more than eight millions of dollars.*

How do the advocates of Mr. Adams defend all abandonments of principle and abuses of power; this lack of patriotism and fraud on the treasury, this neglect of public duty and reward of favorites; this contempt of public morality and of the privileges of the people's representatives; this preference of foreign manufactures and prodigal waste of public money.

They seem to have abandoned all defence in utter despair. When a new abuse is discovered, they get up a new enarge against General Jackson, or new vamp an old one, attempt to draw off the attention of the people from *what is, to what might be,* and induce them to submit to detected dishonesty, and abuse and corruption, through fear of worse evils, should the Farmer of Tennessee be placed at the head of the nation.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*, subject to newspaper postage, and *no more*.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, SEPTEMBER 6, 1828. No. 26.

LETTER IX.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Esquires—Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of the 7th July.

Although, gentlemen, you profess to deprecate every thing calculated to "excite and agitate—to silence the calm voice of reason and truth, by stirring up tumultuous feelings," and suspicions, we have never read an address, bearing such internal evidence as yours does, that you rely upon excitement, agitation, and suspicion, as your ablest agents. We are, indeed, constrained to say, that there is not novelty in the matter, or in the manner of your address—it barely echoes the surmises and the insinuations a thousand times uttered before, by those alarmists, who, being destitute of arguments to convince men, resort to such terrors, as mischievous nurses invent to silence children.

You insinuate, that the friends of Gen. Jackson contend, that the only road through which the presidency should be reached, is the field of battle; but you have not had the goodness to name a single person, who has ever had the audacity to advocate, or the folly to suggest such a doctrine. You labor to instil into the public mind, that the friends of General Jackson consider the sword alone sufficient to open the door to the highest civil office in the republic; but you cannot point out one man, so destitute of patriotism and common sense, as to entertain such a sentiment. What do you consider such conduct as this? Is it manly, liberal, just? Is it not exactly such a course of excitement, alarm, and intimidation, as you pretend to censure, as the genuine characteristics of faction?

But, although you will not venture to meet our appeal to you, to name a single person who advocates any of the doctrines which you insinuate all the friends of Gen. Jackson profess; perhaps you will say, that our support of Gen. Jackson shows that such are our opinions. If such shall be said, the question will arise, whether Gen. Jackson has or has not qualifications besides those of a military character. You assert that he *has not*, and we aver that *he has*.

How is this point to be decided? Surely, not by your assertions, nor by ours, but by facts; yet, we in vain look for facts in your address; you favor the public with assertions and inferences only. Thus, you assert, that Gen. Jackson retired soon, and without distinction, from every civil employment which he filled; but the force of this remark depends not merely upon the meaning of the words "soon" and "distinction," but on the motives of his conduct, which you cannot know. Gen. Jackson was district attorney of the United States, for about seven years, and then resigned—was that "soon" Gen. Jackson executed, with skill and integrity, the duties of every station which he filled—no complaint was ever made against him—was not this serving with "distinction"? or does your estimate of distinction embrace the characteristics of "swelling orators" only? Your assertion, at least, admits, that Gen. Jackson held many civil offices, and of course he was deemed qualified by those who appointed him; it is of no consequence, therefore, how long he held appointments, his tenure of office depended on his own pleasure. Far from impairing our confidence in Gen. Jackson, what you assert on this point increases it; you bring forcibly to our recollection, that Gen. Jackson has not sought offices, but that he has been always solicited to hold them—that, like Washington, he has usually served his country when called on, but has resigned and retired to his farm when the necessity for his service ceased! Such conduct as this is most remarkably different from that of your favorite, we confess; it is for the people to say, which course of conduct they prefer. Mr. Adams has been in office about forty years—has he ever resigned or declined an office? Far from it: he has gathered the emoluments of office with a most greedy hand. Nor has Mr. Clay been more modest—yes, he did on one occasion resign the Speaker's chair to promote his private interests as a member of the bar. Gen. Jackson, however, never deserted a post, from mercenary views—nor has he ever drawn money from the pockets of the people, as Mr. Adams has done, for services never performed!

Such, then, gentlemen, is your evidence of Gen. Jackson's want of civil qualifications: do you think it conclusive? Or do you imagine that the American people are incapable of seeing the fallacy of such proofs?

Conscious of your weakness, on this point, however, you introduce a doctrine, to the nature and tendency of which we anxiously call the public attention. In order to show, that Gen. Jackson has no qualifications but those of a military kind, you describe the qualifications, which, you say, every one should possess, who is proposed for the presidency: The most essential of those qualifications, in your opinion, is, "an experience, or knowledge of public affairs, foreign and domestic;" and you say, that the only assurance, that any individual has such qualifications, is, "the reputation obtained by long and faithful services of a similar kind!"

Such is your doctrine—it does not surprise us, as it accords with the aristocratic characteristics of your address, in other respects. What is this doctrine? It is what Mr. Clay once most bitterly denounced; it is what he now most sturdily upholds—cabinet succession! No man, you say, ought to be president, who is not "a tried and approved statesman,"—who has not an extensive knowledge of public affairs, foreign and domestic: And no man, you say, can have that knowledge, who has not had long and faithful service of a similar kind: can any thing be plainer? No man shall be president, who has not been in the ministry at home or abroad!

This, gentlemen, is the principle which you desire to see established: it is, no doubt, very convenient to those who make a business of ambition, but it is utterly at variance with the genius of our institutions; and, we wish we could say—with the practice under them; but unhappily, the people have in this case great cause for

reproach; they sanctioned a most pernicious example; they abandoned principle for expediency; they tolerated an abuse yesterday, to-day it is a precedent, and to-morrow it will be law, unless the people protest against the fraud.

Did you intend, gentlemen, to go so far? Did you suppose you were not merely advocating the election of Mr. Adams, but that of Mr. Clay as his successor—and not even the succession of Mr. Clay, but that of Mr Clay's Secretary? Your party was accustomed to taunt us republicans, as Napoleon passed from first consul to consul for life—and from consul for life to Emperor; ridiculing, as your party did, the notion of the durability of a republic! the doctrines, which you now openly avow, are in accordance with old sentiments; and yet, gentlemen, you talk of danger to our institutions from a "military chieftain!"

It is most fortunate that selfishness and ambition usually betray themselves: the people have now one more incentive to action, and are indebted to you, gentlemen, for its developement.

Respectfully, yours, &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, January 8th, 1828.

August 12th, 1828.

LETTER X.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Esqrs. Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of the 7th July.

GENTLEMEN: The question, that we are considering, is, whether Gen. Jackson has, or has not, qualifications, besides those of a military kind—you say he has not, and we aver that he has. To prove his unfitness for the presidency, you insist, that long and useful service of a similar kind is indispensable, and that Gen. Jackson has had no such service—on the contrary, you say, he has not held civil offices long, or with distinction—this is the substance of your assertions. We have already shown the pernicious tendency of your succession argument; we shall now expose its fallacy, and show the stations Gen. Jackson has filled, and what has been the character that he has established.

At what period, since the era of independence, were high qualifications most necessary? Was it not, when the heaving of the political waves still told that the storm of the revolution was scarcely over? What is not, when the light of the constitution scarcely began to dispel the gloom of the confederacy? Was it not when the national bark for the first time floated upon the sea of experiment? If such was the crisis, most pregnant with events, and most productive of anxiety, whom did the people take as their pilot? Where were then those cabinet bred ministers, who, alone, you say, have the requisite qualifications? Where were the men who had been ambassadors to kings, and who had found their way through the labyrinths of diplomacy? Franklin existed—he was one of the glories of the age in which he lived—he was as profoundly versed in public affairs, as he was distinguished in the walks of science and literature—he was remarkable for an intimate knowledge of human nature, and a capacity to apply his various acquirements to the affairs of States, as well as those of individuals—he had rendered the most signal services, in the highest civil departments—yet, in preference to this patriot, statesman, philosopher and sage, the American people selected "a mere soldier" as their President! You tell the people, that they should imitate the example of the heroes and sages of the revolution, and you say that they were competent to decide upon the qualifications of a candidate—what, then, was their decision? They were almost all living in 1789, all were active in that trying period, and of all men they preferred Washington, whose prominent merit was his success as a military commander—he had not had the advantages of a classical education—he had never filled any civil station whatever—he had barely acquired a knowledge of surveying, of farming, and of "the trade of a soldier"—he had never trodden upon a foreign soil—yet to him the eyes and the hearts of the people turned as their favorite. Will you, gentlemen, pretend, that if Washington had not been "a military chieftain," such would have been the result? Can you aver that Washington had any of the civil qualifications which you now say are essential, and not to be acquired without long service of a similar kind?

Fortunately, Washington himself declared the truth: on the 30th April, 1789, on taking the oath of office as President, after expressing his reluctance at being called from his farm, the asylum of his declining years, he said: "On the other hand, the magnitude and difficulty of this trust, to which the voice of my country called me, being sufficient to awaken, in the wisest and most experienced of her citizens, a distrustful scrutiny into his qualifications, could not but overwhelm with despondence, one, who inheriting inferior endowments from nature, and *unpractised in the duties of civil administration*, ought to be peculiarly conscious of his own deficiencies. In this conflict of emotions, all I dare aver is, that it has been my faithful study to collect my duty from a just appreciation of every circumstance by which it might be affected.

Such was the avowal of the individual, chosen the first President of this republic, a person unpractised in the duties of civil administration—a fact well known at the time to the people, as the reply of their representatives in Congress declared:

"You have long," said they, "held the first place in the people's esteem: you have often received tokens of their affection: you now possess the only proof that remained of their *gratitude for your past services*."

What past services? not those of a cabinet minister—not those of an ambassador—not those of "a tried and approved statesman"—not services of a civil kind, but those of "a soldier."

Was the republic disappointed? Was Washington found incompetent? If he was compe-

tent at such a crisis, why should not General Jackson be competent now? Our institutions and our credit are now established—Our character is high in the estimation of the world—our citizens have not made greater advances in numbers than in intelligence—a President has several millions of men, from whom to select able counsellors—the people hold the purse and the sword in their own hands: why, then, should they distrust General Jackson? has he ever deceived them? in what instance did a selfish spirit guide him? where has he ever acted, but for his country? what proofs of fitness did Washington give prior to 1789? he answers himself, none of a civil kind: what proofs has Jackson given? his history proves, that, besides that given by Washington, he has given many that Washington never gave. Washington was "a successful military chief"—Jackson never failed to triumph over his country's enemies. Washington, before his elevation to the Presidency, never executed a civil trust—Jackson has executed nearly all the civil trusts in the power of the people or the government to confer.

You perceive, then, gentlemen, that experience proves the fallacy of your doctrine of succession, that no one should be President, who had not been in the political ministry: and we now proceed to show that Gen. Jackson has other qualifications, besides those of a military kind.

1. Gen. Jackson received a classical education: was this no advantage? Some of your associates think it an indispensable requisite, for public trust or private station.

2. He had, like Franklin, to establish his name, without the patronage of a single relative or friend: if he had not had talents and virtues, would he not have remained in obscurity? Could he have arrived at his present celebrity without them? How many in half a century have risen over all impediments as he has done? How many of his assailants could imitate his example?

3. In his 20th year, he was admitted to the bar, and leaving his native State, South Carolina, went to Nashville, to establish a character and earn an independence amongst strangers. Did this not evince strength of mind and talents?

4. Such was the reputation, which he established, that, upon the organization of the territory of the United States south of the Ohio (now called Tennessee,) in May, 1790 Washington appointed him District Attorney, a station which Andrew Jackson held until elected to serve in 1796, in the convention for forming a constitution for Tennessee: Was this no proof of fitness for civil trusts?

5. In his 30th year he was chosen a member of the convention for forming a constitution for Tennessee: what stronger token could a people give of their sense of his integrity and abilities?

6. At the same age he was elected a member of Congress of the United States: was not this an evidence of good character and qualifications for civil stations?

7. In his 31st year, he was elected to represent Tennessee in the Senate of the United States, the most distinguished body of this, or perhaps any country: what could more clearly show a fitness for high trusts?

8. The next station which he filled was that of Judge of the Supreme Court of Tennessee: he held it for several years: did this evince no civil qualifications?

9. Having acquired a moderate estate, he retired from public life, and became a Tennessee farmer: what a contrast with his rival!

10. When Congress authorized the employment of volunteers to defend their country, in the last war, Andrew Jackson left his farm, and appealed to his neighbours and countrymen; 2500 of them placed themselves at his disposal: what stronger proof of his patriotism—what higher evidence of the attachment of his countrymen—need be given?

11 After he had vanquished the confederated Indians, and their more savage allies, he concluded several important treaties with the former, under the direction of government, not only to its satisfaction, but in a manner that commanded the gratitude of the conquered tribes:—are these no tokens of merit?

12. He was appointed governor of Florida, a station requiring the exercise of civil as well as military qualifications: was not this a proof that he possessed them?

13. He was offered, by Mr. Monroe, a seat in the Cabinet, as Secretary at War; but he declined it: was this no evidence of his talents—no proof of his being free from selfish or ambitious views?

14. Mr. Monroe asked him to proceed to Mexico, as Ambassador of the United States:—was this no proof of his having the qualifications of a statesman? he refused to accept the station, because he thought this republic ought not to sanction the military usurpation of Iturbide, by sending a minister to his court—was this such conduct as would distinguish a man, disposed to become himself an usurper?

....Such, gentlemen, are fourteen facts; not assertions: have they no influence upon the question before us? do they not contradict you, when you say that Andrew Jackson has military merits only? do they not support us, when we say, that he has qualifications from nature, education, and experience, competent to the execution of the duties of President? Are not your partisans constantly boasting, that your candidate had the confidence of Washington and other Presidents? if their confidence is a proof of Mr. Adams's merits, why shall not the confidence and applause of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and John Quincy Adams himself, be proofs of General Jackson's merits?

1. President WASHINGTON appointed Andrew Jackson to a high civil trust, which he held for nearly six years.

2. President JOHN ADAMS, in 1820 declared, that he had been attentive to the character and actions of Gen. Jackson—that he considered him one of the greatest military characters that North America had produced—that he was A GREAT MAN, to whom we were all deeply indebted, and whose bust he would preserve as a precious monument, for the contemplation of his, Mr. Adams's, posterity.

3. President JEFFERSON declared, that Andrew Jackson was an undeviating PATRIOT, whom he ranked with Washington, Franklin, &c.—that he was a clear-headed, strong-minded man, with more of the Roman in him than any man living.

4. President MADISON refused to interfere in

the pending election, "from a recollection of "the relation in which he stood to Gen. Jack- "son, whilst President, and of the proofs given "him of the estimation in which he was held."

5. President MONROE said, "my friendship "for Gen. Jackson, and the strong proofs of "confidence and regard I have given him, "whilst President, forbid my taking any part "against him at the ensuing election."

6. President J. Q. Adams said, Gen. Jackson "justly enjoys, in an eminent degree, the pub- "lic favor: of his worth, talents and services, no "one entertains a higher, or more respectful "opinion, than myself"—"his whole career has "been signalized by the purest intentions, and "the most elevated purposes, and his services to "this nation entitle him to its highest rewards."

....Here, gentlemen, are six more *facts*, not *assertions*—have these no influence upon the question before us? Is all that the six Presidents have said and done false and erroneous? Do you admit the competency of your own candidate, to decide, whether a man is or is not worthy of the Presidency. If you admit his competency, what becomes of all the slanders upon Gen. Jackson—and your own objections? John Q. Adams declares that Andrew Jackson deserves the highest rewards that his country can bestow—what is the highest reward? Surely the very station to which you modestly declare he has no claim.

Read over again, we entreat you, the address which you have signed: read especially this sentence: "we are constrained to say, that, if

> "his conduct in office should correspond
> "with any known part of his conduct in
> "life, public or private, there is no ground
> "to hope that he would be governed by
> "any respect for the constitution, the laws,
> "or the rights of his fellow-citizens."

....This, gentlemen, is your solemn assertion in the face of the world; would not a stranger suppose that you allude to some high-way robber? Would any one suppose, that the man, whom you thus most indecently abuse, is the same person whose character is written, not only by the hands of all our Presidents, but in the hearts of a grateful people! Shame—shame, upon the vile passions that could dictate such a libel!

Yours &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTZ,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

August 14th, 1828.

---

*....."To have been rewarded, for these pub- "lic services and others, by a commission "signed by Washington, who never pat- "ronized the undeserving, is a substantial "recommendation."

Such was the language of Mr. C. J. Ingersoll, at a meeting of the bar of Philadelphia, August 23, 1828, called to pay a last tribute of respect to the memory of the late Judge Peters: "Wash- ington never patronized the undeserving."

The following is the form of the commission, given by Washington, to Andrew Jackson: We are not sure that the date is correct, but we believe it is so, and equally correct in all other particulars: The district south of the Ohio, was organized under act of Congress, of May 26, 1790: Andrew Jackson was appointed under it—

"George Washington, President of the United States of America:

To all who shall see these presents, greeting—

"Know ye, that reposing special trust and confidence, in the integrity, ability, and learning of Andrew Jackson, of Nashville, in the territory of the United States, south of the Ohio, I have nominated, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him attorney of the said United States for the district of the said United States south of the river Ohio: and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that office according to law; and to have and hold the same, together with all the power, privileges, and emoluments thereto of right appertaining, unto him the said Andrew Jackson, during the pleasure of the President of the U. S. for the time being: In testimony whereof I have caused these letters to be made patent, and the seal of the United States to be hereto affixed.

Given under my hand, at the City of New-York, the twelfth day of August, in the year of our Lord, one thousand seven hundred and ninety.

[L. S.] (Signed) G. WASHINGTON.

LETTER XI.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Esqrs. Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of the 7th July.

GENTLEMEN: At the meeting, which adopted your address, many correct observations were made by Mr. Hopkinson: "To think freely, to act freely, and to discuss freely," said he, "are essential rights of republicanism—but they must be exercised with a kind, liberal, and accommodating spirit:" Yet this judicious counsel was scarcely given, when you presented your address, containing this assertion:—

> "We are constrained to say, and we say it with reluctance, that, if his (Gen. Jackson's) conduct in office should correspond with any known part of his conduct in life, public or private, there is no ground to hope, that he would be governed by any respect for the constitution, the laws, or the rights of his fellow citizens."

Is this in a kind, liberal, or accommodating spirit? Could malignity itself clothe abuse in any terms so well calculated, as these are, to engender hatred and suspicion?—You say, you reluctantly utter this proscription, and seem to think that your reluctance qualifies or excuses its indecency; but the very reverse is the case; much that is said, during the excitement of a popular assembly, should be forgotten and forgiven at its dissolution; but reluctance shows that you deliberated, and therefore no palliation exists.

That you ought to have been reluctant, who can doubt? for you aver, that Gen. Jackson had

in his private life and public career, violated the constitution, the law, and the rights of his fellow citizens, so often, that even hope of reformation is extinct!—To make such a charge as this, every man ought indeed to be reluctant, because he may be required to prove it; and because such a charge cannot but be regarded as an insult to a whole people—for, of whom is this picture given? a person old enough to be the father of any of his traducers—a man honored with the confidence of all our Presidents—a man, whom no public body, court, or jury, has ever censured—a man who was never fined but once, and then, like Aristides, for being true to his country—a man, who encountered "war, pestilence, and famine" to guard our naked frontiers, whilst the mass of his slanderers were resting on beds of down—a man, who, without patronage or family, has raised himself from obscurity to the highest place in the hearts of his countrymen!

Such is the individual, whom you denounce with a bitterness, that no criminal judge would indulge in when sentencing the most hardened offender! What must the world think of a people, who have not only permitted an uniform violator of all that is sacred, to go unpunished, but have conferred upon him the highest trusts, for nearly forty years?—or, what must they think of you, if they prefer the testimony of the country to your imputations?

Upon that contrast alone, we might rest the question—whether your representation is true or not: but, we prefer an open exposition: we desire that no doubt may exist of our ability, or inclination, to prove that the estimate of Gen. Jackson's character, formed by his country, is correct, and that your description of it is baseless—that his country has been just and generous, but that you are cruel and ungrateful.

Here, at the threshold, however, we are stopped by your own default: you have made one of the most serious charges ever preferred, and yet you have not stated a single instance, in the private life of Gen. Jackson, of any want of integrity, or of any outrage on constitution, law, or the rights of his fellow citizens. You content yourselves with a series of assertions, culled from a catalogue of purchased calumnies, and, in your zeal to preserve the grossness of the original, forget what was due to your country and yourselves.

In the absence of all specification, as to his private life, what are your charges against his public conduct? Has he ever neglected or betrayed his country's interests? has he ever given a vote at variance with republican principles? has he ever defamed the country, from which he was at the time deriving honor and emolument? has he ever been an apostate for office—a common informer for promotion? Let us see.... what are his offences? nobody will doubt your zeal in exposing them: what, then, are they? You refer to three periods only in his political career: 1—in 1796, as a member of Congress: 2—in 1815, at New Orleans: 3—and subsequently, in the Seminole war.

1. As to the first: "Americans," you say, "glory in the name of Washington. General "Jackson has recorded his hostility to that ven- "erated name."*

The design of this assertion is palpable—nothing is more natural than that Americans should venerate the man who fought their battles, and materially contributed to the happiness of their country—nothing is more natural, than that they should consider his enemy, as in some measure their own. To operate upon the feelings of the people, therefore, you have made the above assertion, and the inquiry, that first presents itself, is—*whether this assertion is true?* We cannot hesitate, one moment, in asserting, that *it is not*—it is not only unfounded in itself, but there is a suppression of truths, which, if presented to the public, would have shown its imposture.

If, for instance, you had charged Gen. Washington with shedding American blood in several instances, and had said no more, you would have treated him exactly as you have treated Gen. Jackson—it would have been true, that Gen. Washington had caused American blood to be shed, but the further truth should have been told, that the blood shed was that of traitors, mutineers and deserters—and thus all odium would have been prevented. So that, even the fame of Washington might thus be blasted, by the suppression of the facts material to an honest exposition.

Is such a course as this "kind" or "liberal?" Is it consistent with the habits of our community? Is it honorable to yourselves or to the cause which you espouse?

Americans glory in the names of John Hancock, Samuel Adams, and Edmund Pendleton—the two first were proscribed by the British ministry, at the dawn of the revolution, and the latter was one of the most distinguished whigs of Virginia. What would you have said, if, on the death of such eminent men, Andrew Jackson had voted against paying to their memories "the cheap tribute of crape" for thirty days? Might you not, then, have some apology for asserting, that he recorded his hostility to their venerated names? If such a vote ought to degrade him in the eyes of his countrymen, what do you think of your own candidate? It was not Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, but J. Q. Adams, of Massachusetts, who thus recorded his hostility to Samuel Adams and Edmund Pendleton!

Had the vote of Andrew Jacksnn to which you allude, the least similitude to such a rancorous vote as this? Had that vote the smallest reference to Washington *personally* or *politically*? Farfrom it....it would, indeed, have been publicly base and personally ungrateful, if Andrew Jackson had entertained hostility to Washington, who was not merely his country's shield, but his own earliest benefactor!

What, then, is the foundation of your charge? Gen. Washington having delivered an address to Congress, a reply on the part of the House of Representatives was prepared by Mr. Fisher Ames—this reply, instead of being liberal and patriotic, was factious and insulting to many of the members of the House—upon the question whether such a reply should be adopted, Andrew Jackson recorded his opposition. Was this hostility to Washington? If it was, then the whigs of Pennsylvania were hostile to him, and they included men, respect for whose memory ought to have protected their friend General Jackson, at least from your censure! Yes, it is true, that so early as 1796, Andrew Jackson was in the same ranks with Jefferson, Clifton, Lang-

Jon, Macon, Giles, Monroe, Smilie, Venable, Duval, Butler, Mason, Whitehill, and other distinguished republicans—and it is true, that then and by them was commenced the opposition (not to Washington, but to an aristocratic faction) which ended in the banishment of Mr. John Adams to Braintree! Is this a crime, in the eyes of republicans? No doubt it is in yours, gentlemen, for your principles are aristocratic; but it cannot be in theirs; on the contrary, you have placed in a new light this early claim which Andrew Jackson had upon the gratitude of his countrymen.

Gov. Giles, one of the minority, with whom Gen. Jackson voted, in a letter dated May 5, 1828, gives a faithful history of the vote, to which you object: "Mr. Ames," says he, "might "without difficulty, have obtained *an unanimous* "*and hearty vote*, in favor of his answer (to Gen. "Washington's address) if his sole object had "been *the plaudits of Gen. Washington*, how- "ever highly wrought or extravagant - but *this* "would not content him or his party: the hu- "miliation of their political antagonists seemed "to be the most acceptable portion of his un- "hallowed incense: Mr. Ames made the most "artful and cutting thrusts at them which the "occasion invited."

Thus we see that the republicans, including Gen. Jackson, would have heartily and unanimously recorded praise and gratitude to Washington, but that would not suit Mr. Ames and his party: and who was Mr. Ames, and what were the principles of his party?

"It is in the nature of white birch stakes," said Mr. Ames, "to fail in two years: and "A REPUBLIC wears out its morals, almost "as soon as the sap of a white birch rots the "wood."—*Works of Fisher Ames*—p. 514.

"Our country is too big for *union*—too sor- "did for patriotism—too democratic for "liberty."—*Same*—p. 483.

"Our disease is democracy: it is not the skin "that festers, our very bones are carious, "and their marrow blackens with gan- "grene."—*Same.*

Such were the sentiments of Mr. Ames, the pretended friend of Washington: but what were the principles of Washington?"

"Accustom yourselves," said he, "to *think* and "*speak* of your *union* as the palladium of "your political safety and prosperity." "Is there a doubt whether a common gov- "ernment can embrace so large a sphere? "—let experience solve it: to *listen* to spec- "ulation in such a case were criminal?

"Interwoven as is the love of liberty with "every ligament of your hearts, no recom- "mendation of mine is necessary to fortify "or confirm the attachment.

Which, gentlemen, do you profess, the doctrines of Mr. Ames, or those of Gen. Washington? If the latter, can you be surprised, that the republican party, including Gen. Jackson, refused to sanction an address, penned by Mr Ames—an address, not approbatory of Washington, but masking the hostility of Mr. Ames to the true friends of the Union? With what truth, then, do you assert that Gen. Jackson was hostile to Gen. Washington! is it not manifest that it was Mr. Ames, who was in principle hostile to him? have not the party, to which you belong, systematically acted in direct hostility to Gen. Washington's farewell address?

....The conduct of Gen. Jackson, at New-Orleans, which, collectively, will form an imperishable monument, not only to his own fame, but to the glory of his country, has been, nevertheless, the fruitful topic for defamation. The people, and their representatives, have passed upon it, and by both the gratitude, due to patriotic devotion, has been added to the honors conferred on military skill.

Is not this true? And, as you know it is, is it not an ample reply to your reproaches? Or have you the vanity to suppose, that a garbled statement, made under factious excitement, is to outweigh the details which already constitute grave history?

You assert, that Gen Jackson turned the legislature out of doors, but you err in saying even that: it is a mistake, he simply caused a suspension of deliberations?—And why did he adopt that course? because the legislature proposed to surrender to the enemy a city, which it was the duty of Gen. Jackson to defend: would you, gentlemen, have surrendered the city? If not, then you must approve of the only course by which that calamity could have been averted.

You assert, that *after peace was known to have been made*, Gen. Jackson fettered the press, imprisoned a judge, arrested a patriotic member of the legislature, &c. but you surely do not mean to say, that this, or any part of this, was done, after the existence of peace was known *at New Orleans!* Your language is ambiguous: it seems to have been designed to convey an impression, that this was done by Gen. Jackson, after he knew that peace existed—but we are unwilling to attribute to you a design, that would disgrace the vilest of the many vile slanderers of General Jackson: you cannot mean to say, that General Jackson knew that peace existed, because such an assertion would be inconsistent with truth: What, then, are the facts? Gen. Jackson was responsible for the fate of New Orleans, and had declared martial law—if he had not done so. New Orleans would been betrayed by spies and traitors, and the consequences need not be described: if martial law was an indispensable measure, then it became the duty of the General to see that it was not a dead letter; to see that even judges and legislators should not betray their country! The defence is, therefore, brief, as it has hitherto been triumphant.

But, gentlemen, if Gen. Jackson really did, and you say he did, commit such outrages upon constitution, law, and personal rights, is it not marvellous, that the Congress of the Union, whilst the events were fresh in memory, in the session of 1815, passed resolutions of thanks, and voted gold medals, to him†—Nay, gentlemen, we will bring the matter still closer to yourselves: you know that every member of Congress swears to support the constitution; you know that a member, who has a knowledge that a public officer violated the constitution and the law, and yet omits to call him to account, is himself guilty of a breach of trust. Let us then apply these facts to one of yourselves, Mr. John Sergeant: he was in Congress, perhaps earlier than, but certainly in 1818; all the acts done at N Orleans in 1815 were then as well known as they are now, what are we to think of a Representative,

who then overlooked the outrages which his pen now describes in such appalling colors?—Did Mr. Sergeant neglect his country then, or is his present alarm factitious? Is it true, that, with a knowledge of the existence of peace, Gen. Jackson did trample on constitution, law, and personal liberty—and if it is, why did not Mr. Sergeant call for inquiry and for punishment? And if Mr. Sergeant did not call for inquiry, as he was bound by the most sacred obligations to do, is it not conclusive that, in 1818, he did not believe that any such outrages had been committed? And if he did not then believe so, how has the conviction to the contrary been since produced? No, gentlemen, allow us to say, without meaning disrespect, that you act under excitement—you write under excitement—and it is not in your power to convince an intelligent people, of the fairness of representations, in which, in moments of reflection, you cannot yourselves confide.

The third branch of your censure shall be noticed in our next letter.

Yours, &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

August 16th, 1828.

---

* There are not, in Pennsylvania, two more violent opposers of Gen. Jackson, than Messrs. Abner Lacock and Jonathan Roberts——the journal of the United States Senate, of January, 1819, records their hostility to the venerated name of Washington in these terms—on a motion to carry into effect a resolution of Congress, of August 7, 1783, for erecting a statue to Washington, the YEAS were 30, the NAYS 6, including in this lank minority Messrs. Lacock and Roberts!!

† The following resolutions will be found among the laws of the United States, adopted in February, 1815.

"*Resolved*, By the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That the thanks of Congress, be, and they are hereby given to MAJOR-GENERAL JACKSON, and through him, to the officers and soldiers of the regular army, of the militia, and of the volunteers under his command, the greater proportion of which troops consisted of *militia and volunteers*, suddenly collected together, for their UNIFORM GALLANTRY and GOOD CONDUCT, *conspicuously displayed against the enemy*, FROM THE TIME OF HIS LANDING BEFORE NEW ORLEANS, UNTIL HIS FINAL EXPULSION THEREFROM: and *particularly* for their *valor, skill, and good conduct* on the *eighth of January* last, in repulsing, with great slaughter, *a numerous British army of chosen veteran troops*, when attempting, by a bold and daring attack to carry by storm, the works hastily thrown up for the protection of New Orleans, and thereby obtaining a most signal victory over the enemy, with a disparity of loss, on his part, UNEXAMPLED IN MILITARY ANNALS.

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be requested to cause to be struck, a Gold Medal, with devices emblematical of this splendid achievement, and presented to Major General Jackson, *as a testimony of the high sense entertained by Congress of his* JUDICIOUS *and distinguished conduct on that memorable occasion.*

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be requested to cause the foregoing resolutions to be communicated to MAJOR-GENERAL JACKSON, in such terms as he may deem best calculated to give effect to the objects thereof."

LETTER XII.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Esquires, Authors of an address adopted at the Administration town meeting of the 7th July.

GENTLEMEN: In the speech of Mr. Hopkinson, to which, in our last letter, we took the freedom to refer, that gentleman very correctly said, that the sense of the people is not to be ascertained from "the intemperate addresses of self-called meetings, or the more intemperate harangues of inflamed and swelling orators:" it would, indeed, be a blot upon the reputation of Philadelphia, if any portion of our community had deliberately sanctioned your address; and it is due to that community to say, that it bears no more resemblance to the acts of our citizens, calmly executed, than the harangues to which Mr. Hopkinson referred, do to the exalted feelings of the people of the South.

What part did your meeting, what part did even you, gentlemen, take, in the formation of your address? you were appointed upon the spot to report an address; your chairman, Mr. Sergeant, produced one already written, but which none of you, as a committee at least, even considered; in the haste and bustle incident to the meeting, the address was read by you, or perhaps not read at all; with the exception of your chairman, you had no sort of opportunity to consider the nature of the charges made in it; but, relying on him, you agreed to report the instrument as your deliberate act! The self-called meeting then adopted in mass the harangue of its "inflamed" author! and thus gave the world one of the most gross productions that the intemperance of any faction has ever sanctioned.

Is such a course consistent with the character of Philadelphia? Is it such as, in private life, any of you would venture to pursue? Is there one of you, even the chairman himself, who would charge any fellow-citizen with wanton and deliberate murder, ? If any of you believed that any murders had been committed, would you not consider it a solemn duty to pursue the offender?

Upon what principle, then, is it that you justify your doing as politicians, what you would not dare, or what you would blush to do, as private men? Would you not feel yourselves in an awkward predicament, if called upon to sub-

slanderer before a jury, the foul crimes you impute to Gen. Jackson before the public? But, gentlemen, you fancy that you are safe, because conscious innocence is a shield sufficiently ample to protect Gen Jackson from all aspersions, because his country has already refused to censure him, and you really were not aware of the extent of your own denunciation—is it not so?

For our own part, we entirely acquit all of you, except your chairman, of responsibility for your address; we do not believe that, your chairman excepted, any of you understood its real character, and we shall be able to show that your chairman himself, either did not believe what he has now, when inflamed, written, or that if he did believe it, he has most grossly abused the confidence placed in him by this district.

The third branch of your address embraces occurrences subsequent to the peace of 1815, in the Indian and Spanish settlements. You are not, indeed, as precise as men writing on a solemn subject, and appearing before the public, ought to be. You do not mention dates, places or persons; but in sweeping terms, you assert that Gen. Jackson has looked upon blood and carnage with composure, if not enjoyment; and that he has eagerly caught at every opportunity to shed American blood, without any authority but arbitrary power! This picture, you must confess, could not have had a higher colouring: history does not present a ruffian whose propensities were more atrocious than those attributed to Gen. Jackson! Such of you, gentlemen, as really desire to be esteemed and beloved, as good and intelligent men, cannot but feel some "compunctious visitings," as you look upon the hideous object, which an inflamed temperament has thus seduced you to present to the public eyes! At least you ought to have inquired—and compared—and given facts and evidence; but you disdain the performance of such duties, and offer bare assertions!

Now, you must be aware that it is utterly impossible for us to meet a sweeping allegation, except by a positive denial of its truth. If you had given dates, names, and places, we would have entered upon the inquiry; but there is not a man in the penitentiary who would not justly consider himself injured and abused, if you had applied to him the terms which you recklessly employ against a patriot who stands highest in the hearts of his countrymen. We fling back, then, all such imputations as foul and slanderous.

....When Gen. Jackson had defeated, on the plain of Orleans, the best appointed army ever embodied in America—when his own army, uninjured, saw the remnant of their enemies in disorder and flight, and sought to pursue them, what was the conduct of Gen Jackson? Did He, who you say, enjoys the sight of blood, then assent to the wishes of his troops? Did He desire, in pursuit of military renown, to slaughter the fugitives of a panic-stricken enemy? What commander, all circumstances considered, would have checked his own and his army's thirst for still greater results? Far from indulging any such vain-glorious and cruel inclinations, he forbade all pursuit—and by doing so, he incurred the resentment and displeasure of some of his own ardent troops.

We next see him entering upon a campaign against the ruthless Indians who give no quarter—and their more cruel allies who aroused all their ferocious passions. Instead of suffering his troops to obey the law of retaliation, he thus, in his orders to them, inculcates the soundest principles of humanity and discipline:—

"How shall a war," said General Jackson, "so long forborne, and so loudly called for by retributive justice, be waged? Shall we imitate the example of our enemies, in the disorder of their movements, and savageness of their dispositions? Is it worthy of the character of American soldiers, who take arms to redress the wrongs of an injured country, to assume no better model than that furnished them by barbarians? No! fellow-soldiers—great as are the grievances that have called us from our homes, we must not permit disorderly passions to tarnish the reputation we shall carry along with us; we must and will be victorious—but we must conquer as men, who owe nothing to chance; and who, in the midst of victory, can still be mindful of what is due to humanity."

Let us not, however, appeal to the public addresses of Gen. Jackson to his troops, emphatic as they are. Let us inquire what his country thought of his acts when they were fresh in memory, and closely scrutinized. Let us see what your own candidate, Mr. J. Q. Adams said; what was the solemn conviction of Thomas Jefferson, whom you, gentlemen, joined in eulogizing—and what were the conduct and opinions of your own chairman, Mr. John Sergeant.

There seems to be some excuse for the Spanish Ministers and the British journalists who censured the conduct of General Jackson in the war in the Indian and Florida settlements—but it is difficult to make any sort of apology for those Americans, who have exceeded all foreign agents and journalists, in the abuse of their own officers and government. Fortunately for the reputation of the country, Gen. Jackson's conduct has been subjected to every ordeal calculated to expose criminality or proclaim innocence—with the reputation of his country, Gen. Jackson's has escaped unhurt, and to no champion is he more indebted than to your own candidate, Mr. J. Q. Adams—that gentleman, in an official letter to our minister at the court of Spain, said:

> "In passing unnoticed this and other invec-
> "tives against an officer (Gen. Jackson),
> "*whose services to this nation entitle him to*
> "*their highest rewards, and whose whole ca-*
> "*reer has been signalized by the purest in-*
> "*tentions, and the most elevated purposes,*
> "I wish to be understood as abstaining
> "from observations, which, however
> "justified by the occasion, could but add
> "to the unpleasantness of the discus-
> "sion."

Again—Mr. Adams said....

> "But the President will neither inflict pun-
> "ishment, nor pass censure upon General
> "Jackson, for that conduct, the *motives* of
> "which were founded in the *purest patriot-*
> "*ism*; of the *necessity* for which he had the
> "most immediate and effectual means of
> "forming a judgment; and the *vindication*
> "of which is written in every page of

"tue laws of nations, as well as the first
"law of nature, self-defence."

To the testimony of Mr. Adams, we add that of Mr. Jefferson.

"THOMAS JEFFERSON returns his thanks to
"General Jackson, for the kindness he has
"been so good as to send him, of the vin-
"dication of the proceedings in the Se-
"minole war. If doubts of those proceed-
"ings have existed in candid minds, this
"able vindication can scarcely fail to re-
"move them. In addition to what had
"been laid before the public, it brings
"forward some new views, and new facts
"of great weight. On the whole, he can-
"not doubt, but that the gratitude of his
"country, for former achievements, will
"be fortified by those new proofs of the
"salutary energies of their *great benefactor*.
"He salutes the General with assurances
"of his constant and affectionate attach-
"ment and high respect."

"Nov. 1820."

It is not, however, upon the testimony of Mr. Jefferson, given in his retirement, or on that of Mr. Adams, as Secretary of State, that we need rely: we have the solemn decision of the House of Representatives U. S., of which one of you, gentlemen, (Mr. John Sergeant,) was at the time a member. In January and February, 1819, all the great questions, upon which you now seek to agitate the public mind, were fully discussed—at that time all the information now had, was fully possessed—let us, then, see what the grand council of the nation determined.

After a debate, that continued for a month, January, 1819, the following resolutions were thus decided upon in Committee of the Whole House:

1. "*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the United States disapproves the proceedings in the trial and execution of Alexander Arbuthnot and Robert C. Ambrister—

For this resolution.....54
Against it.....90

2. "*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs be instructed to prepare and report a bill to this House, prohibiting in time of peace, or in the time of war, with any Indian tribe or tribes only, the execution of any captive, taken by the army of the U. S. without the approbation of such execution by the President—

For this resolution 57
Against it.....98

3. "*Resolved*, That the late seizure of the Spanish forts of Pensacola and St. Carlos de Barancas, in West Florida, by the army of the U. S. was contrary to the constitution of the United States.

For this resolution.....65
Against it.....91

And when the subject was finally disposed of, on the 8th of February, 1819, the several questions were thus determined:

For disapproving of the trial and execution of Alexander Arbuthnot:

Ayes....62,
Noes ...108—including Mr. John Sergeant.

For disapproving of the trial and execution of R. C. Ambrister:

Ayes....63
Noes....107—including Mr. John Sergeant.

Mr. Cobb then offered this resolution—

"*Resolved*, That this house disapprove of the [illegible] and occupation of Pensacola and the

* It is remarkable, that, whilst the partisans of Mr. Adams now condemn the acts of retributive justice, performed by Gen. Jackson upon the domestic and foreign savages, who desolated our frontiers, they keep entirely out of sight the memorable fact, that Mr. Adams coolly, in his closet, defended every one of them: in one of his letters to our minister in Spain, Mr. Adams enumerated some of the atrocities, now wholly kept out of view by his friends, and quaintly asked, whether such facts were not sufficient to cool the sympathies excited in behalf of such monsters as he describes?

"The Spanish government is not at this day to be informed, that, cruel as war in its mildest forms must be, it is, and necessarily must be, doubly cruel when waged with savages; that savages make no prisoners but to torture them; that they give no quarters; that they put to death, without discrimination of age or sex. That these ordinary characteristics of Indian warfare, have been applicable, in their most heart-sickening horrors, to that war left us by Nicholls, as his legacy, reinstigated by Woodbine, Arbuthnot, and Ambrister, and stimulated by the approbation, encouragement, and aid of the Spanish commandant at St. Marks, is proof required? Entreat the Spanish Minister of State, for a moment, to overcome the feelings, which details like these must excite, and to reflect, if possible, with composure upon the facts stated in the following extracts, from the documents enclosed:

Letter from sailing-master Jairus Loomis to Commodore Daniel T. Patterson, 13th August, 1816, reporting the destruction of the negro fort:

"On examining the prisoners, they stated that Edward Daniels, O. S. who was made prisoner in the boat, on the 17th July, *was tarred and burnt alive.*"

Letter from Archibald Clarke to General Gaines, 26th February, 1817. (Message, P. U. S. to Congress, 25th March, 1818, p. 9.)

"On the 24th inst. the house of Mr. Garret, residing in the upper part of this county, near the boundary of Wayne county, (Georgia,) was attacked during his absence, near the middle of the day, by this party [of Indians,] consisting of about fifteen, who shot Mrs. Garret in two places, and then despatched her by stabbing and scalping. Her two children, one about three years, the other two months, were also murdered, and the eldest scalped; and the house was then plundered of every article of value, and set on fire."

Letter from Peter B. Cook, (Arbuthnot's clerk,) to Eliza A. Carney, at Nassau, dated Suwahnee, 19th January, 1818, giving an account of their operations with the Indians, against the Americans, and the massacre of Lt. Scott and his party.

"There was a boat that was taken by the Indians, that had in it thirty men, seven women, four small children. There were six of the men got clear, and one woman saved, and all the rest got killed. The children were taken by the legs, and their brains dashed out against the boat."

fortress of Barrancas by the army of the U. "S. and the establishment of a civil govern- "ment therein without the authority of Con- "gress—

For this resolution....70

Againstit....100—including Mr. J. Sergeant.

Thus, after an ardent debate, in which all the passions and feelings of the members were appealed to, in order to censure Gen. Jackson—and in the course of which all the acts of General Jackson, in his campaigns, were referred to—he was triumphantly released from all censure, with the full concurrence of Mr. John Sergeant, himself, acting under the most solemn obligations!

To show that the charges now made, were then made, it is barely necessary to refer to the debates themselves: *Mr. Holmes*, for instance, said—"It will require pretty strong proof to pro- "duce conviction, that Gen. Jackson has inten- "tionally done wrong: at his age, crowned with "the honors, and loaded with the gratitude of "his country, what adequate motive could in- "duce him to tarnish his glory by acts of cru- "elty and revenge?"

No proof was given—no conviction of error, much less crime, was produced, and Gen. Jackson came forth, released from censure by an overwhelming majority!

....Which, then, are we to believe—

1. Thomas Jefferson.
2. John Q. Adams.
3. James Monroe, who, after this decision conferred appointments on Gen. Jackson.
4. The U. S. Senate, which confirmed those appointments.
5. The House of Representatives, including Mr. John Sergeant.

Or—

1. Mr. John Sergeant.
2. Mr. Manuel Eyre.
3. Mr. L. Lewis.
4. Mr. C. C. Biddle.
5. Mr. J. P. Norris, jr.

Is it to be believed, that Mr. Sergeant was ignorant in 1819? Is it to be credited, that he was then destitute of patriotism and humanity also? Was not every fact then known, that is known now? Was there a single act of General Jackson's career, which was not eagerly dragged into a protracted and ardent debate? How happened it, then, that Mr. Sergeant invariably voted in favor of Gen. Jackson?

If Gen Jackson had, in the course of his operations, eagerly caught at every opportunity to shed American blood, upon his own arbitrary will, why did Mr. Sergeant support him? If Gen. Jackson had shown a composure at blood and carnage, why did Mr. Sergeant invariably act with his friends in his behalf?

If it was true, that Gen. Jackson had been so prodigal of blood, American blood, as to shed it with eagerness, and illegally, why did not Mr. Sergeant proclaim the fact to Congress? Why did he not demand an inquiry? Why did he not protest against an honorable acquittal? Why did he solemnly record his own votes, in opposition to Mr. Clay and his faction, in favor of that acquittal?

To these questions we make no specific reply—that task we leave to a dispassionate public, abstaining, as we do, even from those comments which seem to be demanded by respect for the principles of retributive justice.

Yours, &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES. S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

August 18th, 1828.

LETTER XIII.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Esqrs. Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of 7th July.

Gentlemen: You have incorporated with your address, the speech delivered at your meeting, by Mr. Hopkinson, and made it, like your address, a fair subject for comment. We propose to notice one part of it, in connexion with your own sentiments on the same topic.

You attribute the opposition that is made to Mr. Adams, to a variety of personal considerations—but Mr. Hopkinson asserts, that the question does not turn on the merits or qualifications of candidates; it is, says he, "a struggle between a southern and northern policy—between a man of the north, and one of the south."

It must be confessed, that the position thus taken, is a very important one—it is an assertion, that Mr. Adams is the representative of what is called a northern policy; that his friends alone are the friends of that policy; that Gen. Jackson is the representative of a southern policy, and the friends of that policy are his only supporters—this, we take it, is the substance of the position there assumed.

"One of the expedients of party," said Gen. Washington, in his farewell address, "to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and views of other districts."

We do not attribute to Mr. Hopkinson the design here referred to—he, no doubt, entertains the opinion that he expresses, erroneous as it is; and it is because such men do express such opinions, that it becomes necessary to show their error. Although such is the case, in relation to Mr. Hopkinson, we can make no such allowance for many others—we have no doubt that the aims of the people of the south are grossly misrepresented in Pennsylvania, for the purpose of acquiring influence there, producing those jealousies and heart-burnings which Washington so pathetically deprecates. Patriots and men of sense would have seen, as Mr. Hopkinson did, in the late ebullitions in the south, nothing but a momentary feeling; but you, gentlemen, under excitement, attribute them to nothing less than treason!

It appears to us to be a fallacy, to say, that Mr. Adams is the representative of a policy which he has never had the manliness to recommend; or that Gen. Jackson is opposed to a

policy which he has upheld by his vote and written declaration—so that, in truth, if the question before the people is, as Mr. Hopkinson says, a mere question of policy, the American System, it is the north that ought to support Gen. Jackson, for his sentiments are avowed.

The constitution of the United States, 2d article, 3d section, declares that the President of the United States "*shall*, from time to time, recommend to the consideration of Congress, such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient"—and in his oath of office, Mr. Adams swore, that he would faithfully execute what the constitution enjoined. Is the American system necessary or expedient? If it is, why has Mr. Adams refused to recommend it? He must have violated his duty, if he believed it necessary or expedient, and did not recommend—or, if he refused to recommend it, because he deemed it unnecessary, then he is not the friend of the northern policy. We shall be glad, gentlemen, if you will enable us to decide, on which horn of this dilemma your candidate is to be fixed!

No such dilemma exists in the case of Gen. Jackson. When he came to act upon his oath, he did not shun the question as Mr. Adams did. The father of the tariff of 1824, Mr. Henry Baldwin, thus speaks on this subject:

"We support as our candidate the man, who, in every emergency, risked his life for his country, and who, disregarding all considerations of local popularity, took his stand in the south, *in favor of the American System*, and with the same firmness with which he had often foiled our enemies, boldly announced his devotion to its principles. In *him* there was no *mystery*, no *diplomacy*, every one can understand *his* meaning—*these* are the words of Gen. Jackson....

"Heaven smiled upon, and gave us *liberty* "and *independence*. The same Providence "has blessed us with *the means of national* "*independence and national defence*. If we "omit, or refuse to use the gifts which *he* "has extended to us, we deserve not the "continuation of *His* blessings. *He* has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals—with *lead, iron and copper*, and given "us climate and soil for the *growing* of *hemp* "and *wool*. These being the grand materials for our national defence, *they ought to* "*have extended to them adequate and fair pro-* "*tection*, that our own manufacturers and laborers may be placed on a fair competition "with those of Europe, and that we may "have, *within our country*, a supply of those "leading and important articles, so essential "in war."

....Who has written more than Mr. Adams? who is fonder of appearing in print than he is? He has even taken the pains to proclaim, that he never will be a free-mason! and, yet, no man has ever seen an avowal from his pen on the subject of a tariff! Is it no illusory, then, to, pretend that he is identified with it, or with any fixed principle on the subject?

....Let us return to the position of Mr. Hopkinson, and consider it in reference to the South; in effect, it is this—that the South is impelled by influences of a sectional character, and not by patriotism, in its support of Gen. Jackson: that, instead of supporting Gen. Jackson, or opposing Mr. Adams, from an honest preference of the one, or objection to the other, they are struggling for a Southern, or against a Northern policy. All who know the capacity of the gentleman who urges this doctrine, must be convinced, that, if any facts or arguments to support this position existed, he could have produced them: and all, who know his zeal, must admit, that he would have produced them: but we in vain seek such authority in his address—instead of it, he asks a series of questions, leaving his hearers to make such replies, as their several degrees of intelligence, candor, or prejudice, might enable or prompt them to give.

If, says Mr. H it is not a struggle between the northern and southern policy, why does Virginia now support Gen. Jackson, after opposing him four years ago? why do presses, that then censured, now applaud him?

A simple answer to these inquiries might be made, by asking, why Virginia and certain presses, which four years ago opposed Mr. Adams, should now support him? If Virginia and certain presses had then supported Mr. Adams, it might well be asked, what had produced the change; but, as they have been *consistent in opposition* to Mr. Adams, we are at a loss to conceive why they should be rebuked.

Or, is it pretended, that, because men change, their motives must therefore be unworthy? if this is insisted upon, what are we to think of Mr. Clay? who, with or without character, in the South, ever assailed Gen. Jackson as bitterly as Mr. Clay assailed Mr Adams in the West? who flung at Gen. Jackson, such a mass of coarse invective as was cast upon Mr Adams, by Mr. Lacock, in Pennsylvania? yet Mr. Clay and Mr. Lacock are now the sturdy advocates of the former object of their obloquy! Do you, gentlemen, know no presses, which four years ago, covered Mr. Adams with vulgar opprobrium, that now eulogize him?

The question, in each case of change, is what were the *motives* of the parties? and, according to this rule, the southern support of Gen. Jackson is as honorable and manly, as the support of Mr. Adams, by his former revilers is mean and mercenary.

In his speech, Mr. Hopkinson treated the people of the south with a liberality, very much in contrast, gentlemen, with your harshness: I anticipated from the South, all unexcited minds must, all that is honorable and safe, from the force of facts and reflection: but still, we think he erred in ascribing to sectional feeling or interest their devotion to a cause which they honestly think involves not merely a question of taxation, but *national existence itself*.

Can no motives of a national, honorable, and personal kind, be assigned for the support of Gen. Jackson in the South?

....Men of the South have been invariably of the republican party: their Jeffersons, Madisons and Monroes had, at a memorable epoch, an ardent friend in Gen. Jackson. Is it not natural, therefore, that they should prefer him to Mr. Adams, whose political principles have at all times been at variance with their own?

....Men of the South are distinguished for a patriotism that never calculates, and for a spirit that is somewhat chivalrous. What then is more natural, than that they should prefer a gallant defender of his country, to a pers-

whose aim has been office for the sake of its emoluments? They saw Jackson pledging his estate to raise money to defend his country, at the very moment when Mr. Adams was exacting from that country the uttermost cent, to invest in Russian stocks! They saw Mr. Adams coolly calculating in Europe, the downfal of his country; and, they beheld General Jackson averting the danger, and defeating his country's enemy! They saw Mr. Adams, in Europe, sarcastically scoffing at the militia as cowards and runaways—and Gen. Jackson gallantly leading the militia to triumph over the army, which Mr. Adams predicted would crush us at a blow!

....Men of the South have too much virtue and pride to enter the political market, to traffic away the rights of their countrymen. Of all the American people, they are the least expert at making bargains, from a natural repugnance to what is deceptious: From the dawn of the revolution to the present day, no Judas has been found in their ranks. When the Presidency was set up to the highest bidder, no envoy, "with tears in his eyes," was despatched by them to chaffer for offices—no pledge was asked or held by them, as if the agents of the people had become swindlers. Is it wonderful, then, that the men of the South should support Jackson, who preferred that the earth should swallow him rather than owe his elevation to corrupt means—and oppose Mr. Adams, who succeeded by a double contract of a corrupt character?

....Men of the South are distinguished for sincerity and manly frankness: They know that Mr. Adams has never ventured publicly to advocate a tariff, and that he has been equally cautious not to oppose it—they cannot reconcile silence on such a topic with public duty, or personal honor: They know that Gen. Jackson voted for the tariff of 1824, and that he disdains to conceal his anxiety for all *national* advantages: They know that he will not, if President, seek to sacrifice the interests of one quarter of the Union to promote those of another, as Mr. Clay had said Mr. Adams did at Ghent. What, then, can be more patriotic or prudent, than the preference of a national statesman?

....Besides, is it not very natural, that men of the South should honor the West, which has always treated them with kindness, rather than the East, which has always treated them with ingratitude and obloquy—

"For eight years," says Mr. Mathew Carey, in his Olive Branch, "the most unceasing endeavors have been used, to poison the minds of the people of New-England towards, and to alienate them from, their fellow-citizens of the Southern States. The people of the latter section have been portrayed as demons incarnate, and destitute of all the qualities that dignify or adorn human nature! Nothing can exceed the violence of those caricatures, some of which would have suited the ferocious inhabitants of New Zealand, rather than a civilized or polished nation."—p. 253.

"The unholy and demoniac spirit that inspired the writer of the above vile libel, (——signed Pelham, 1800) has been from that hour to the present incessantly employed to excite hostility between the different sections of the Union. To such horrible lengths has this spirit been carried, that many paragraphs have occasionally appeared in the Boston papers, *intended and calculated to excite the negroes of the southern States to rise and massacre their masters!*—This will undoubtedly appear incredible to the reader; it is nevertheless *sacredly true*: It is a species of turpitude and baseness, of which the world has produced few examples!"—p. 254.

Mr. Carey then proceeds to refer to official documents to prove the relative commercial standing of the Eastern States, in contrast with the Southern States; and says—

"I am tired of this exposure—I sicken for the honor of the human species: what idea must the world form of the arrogance of the pretensions of one side (Eastern States) and, on the other, of the folly and weakness of the rest of the Union, to have so long suffered them to pass without exposure or detection."

"The naked fact is, that the demagogues in the Eastern States, not satisfied with deriving all the benefits from the Southern States, which they would from so many wealthy colonies—with making princely fortunes by the carriage and transportation of their bulky and valuable productions—and supplying them with their own manufactures, and the manufactures and productions of Europe and the East and West Indies, to an enormous amount, and at an immense profit—*have uniformly treated them with outrage, insult and injury.*"—*p.* 269.

"I repeat it, and hope the solemn truth will be borne in constant remembrance, that the Southern States are virtually colonies to those States, whose demagogues have never ceased slandering and persecuting them."—*p.* 280.

....Such is the picture of the Eastern section of the Union, drawn by the pencil of Mr. Carey one of your own present partisans: Is it calculated to attract Southern admiration? Is it surprising that the South refuses to honor those who have treated them so long with injury and insult? Let it not be said, that either times or men have, within a few years, changed—the very demagogues, who thus reviled the South, who sought to poison the minds of their countrymen, who, according to Mr. Carey, p. 252, sought to dissolve the Union so long ago as 1796, are now unanimous for Mr. Adams—whilst the republican minority of New England, always faithful to their country, are opposed to him! To which does Pennsylvania lean? To the Eastern demagogues or to the Union? To the Middle, South and West, or to a faction, that are tyrants in power, and disposed to be traitors rather than not rule the Union?

....The people of Pennsylvania cannot mistake the question before them: if the question is connected with the tariff, then they have the vote and the written declaration of Gen. Jackson on one side, and the utter silence of Mr. Adams on the other: But it is not the question of a tariff, that is now to be decided; matters of higher moment are to be settled. We are not inquiring, whether, this or that particular policy is to be pursued—but, *whether the constitu-*

tion and the Union are to exist: for it is idle to pretend, that the constitution or the Union can exist, if the people shall sanction the sale of the Presidency in the capitol. Who will not despair of a republic, if the people shall calmly look on, whilst their dearest rights are staked upon a political gaming table, to become the prize of the most desperate dealer in corruption. *This* is the question, and not local or sectional policy, which is now to be determined; and if it is true, as Mr. Jefferson asserts, that, to preserve the constitution itself, the law may on an emergency be over-leaped, who is not prepared to make local or personal sacrifices, to preserve that constitution? It would be a poor consolation, to have a tariff, without a constitution, or to maintain a local policy without a bond of national union: but *with the Constitution and Union, we shall preserve all that is dear to man.*

Respectfully, yours, &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS. M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

From the Rochester Daily Advertiser.

QUID PRO QUO—THE BARGAINING SYSTEM DEVELOPED.

MR. CLAY—GEN. PORTER—AND THE NEW-YORK LEGISLATURE OF 1824.

The surprise excited throughout the State by the selection of General Peter B. Porter as Chief of a prominent Department of the National Government, is a guarantee that the following will meet an attentive and general perusal. The causes of an appointment so singular—the *services* for which this distinguished station is the reward—are delineated, in part, by an individual whose station rendered him familiar with the facts at the time, and whose character forbids the supposition that he has wilfully misstated the particulars.

In connexion with the developments made by Mr. Kendall of Kentucky—a former confidential friend of Mr. Clay—this statement exhibits, in all their naked deformity, the means unsuccessfully pursued by Mr. Clay, through his Agents, for bringing himself before the House of Representatives as a candidate for the Presidency at the last election. The substance of Mr. Kendall's exposition, copied from the Albany Argus, is submitted to our readers on the first page. To such of them as have not read it—to such as seek materials for estimating the character of Henry Clay—to such as honestly believe in his political purity—to such, we repeat, these expositions should be fully understood. It is not to be supposed that the politician who could thus scheme and electioneer for himself with the Representatives of the People, would shrink from bargaining with a rival candidate, when no other means were left, to partition that power between themselves which the People designed for a third person.

The facts narrated below are such as should command public attention. The system of bargain and sale, consummated by the last Presidential election, has received less consideration than it deserves. The transactions in the New-York Legislature of '24 form no inconsiderable feature of that system. They are placed in a striking light by the plain, unadorned detail, furnished by our correspondent.

It is only necessary to refer to Mr Kendall's exposition, to establish the fact that *General Porter was guided in all his intrigues for advancing Mr. Clay's interests, by the plans and instructions of Clay himself!* He was literally the puppet of Mr. Clay, to whose gratitude he is now indebted for the Secretaryship of War. He obeyed the impulse of that calculating politician, with a zeal and precision more creditable to his docility than his honor. The abstract of Mr Kendall's exposition, furnished by the Argus, contains the following passage in relation to this subject. It will be seen that, in a letter to Mr. Kendall, dated *eight months previous to the choice of electors in the state of New-York*, Mr. Clay had *planned the game which was to be performed by his few friends in the Legislature of New-York!*

We entreat the reader, to attend particularly to the terms of Mr. Clay's letter, and compare them with the course of General Porter in the Legislature of 1824, as detailed by our correspondent. They *agree in every particular*, and indelibly fix upon Mr Clay and Gen. Porter the charge of having *secretly conspired to divide, distract, or divert the electoral vote of the State of New-York, in any channel which might best subserve the ambitious schemes of Mr. Clay!*

☞ *Look upon this picture!* ☜

From the Albany Argus.

"To the people of this State, the most extraordinary and the most striking of these corrupt acts, is the deep game played by Mr. Clay and his friends in the New York legislature of 1824. In these scenes of intrigue, no doubt his present very befitting associate, the Hon. the Secretary at War, fully enacted his part. The fact disclosed in the letter of Mr. Clay to Mr Kendall of the 18th of March, 1824, will strike the republicans of New York, at least, with surprise. In that letter, Mr. Clay—the *pure*, the *modest*, the *disinterestedness*, the *patriotic* Mr. Clay—calculates thus closely on managing the Electoral Votes of the State of New-York. He says:

"New York continues to be a contested State. My decided opinion is, that it will give it's support to Mr. Adams *or to me*, or perhaps *divide it between us* In that case, Mr. Crawford cannot come into the House. My friends are confident in the belief, that if I enter the House as one of the three highest, *no matter with what associates*, I *shall be elected*. If, contrary to all probability, Mr. Crawford should obtain the vote New York, the contest for an entry into the House will probably be between Jackson and me. In Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey, I have reason to count up some support.—Without entering into further particulars, my opinion is that my

friends have every motive to vigorous, animated, and persevering exertion."

Mark the fact! Eighth months before the vote of this State was given, Mr. Clay predicts that it will be *divided between himself and Mr. Adams*—a result which, owing to the choice of electors by the legislature, was deemed by the honest and uninitiated, scarcely possible, but which nevertheless *actually took place!* Who will doubt that Mr. Clay and his agent were actively engaged, during all the summer, in bargaining for a division of the votes here, and that they ultimately effected it, for the purpose of enabling him to get into the House of Representatives, where (from his skill in intrigue) he seemed to feel confident of success, "who ever were his associates?" And who will doubt, when, with all his efforts, he was excluded from the House, he *bargained and coalesced* with Mr. Adams for the Secretaryship, as a stepping-stone to the future attainment of what he had already sought by such shameful means?"

☞ *And then upon this!* ☜

To the Editors of the Daily Advertiser.

GENTLEMEN: That H. Clay was instrumental in making Mr. Adams President, and that Mr. A. in return rewarded him with the highest office in his power, are facts of public notoriety. But that there was any corrupt understanding between the parties, is of course denied by both principals and their partisans; and in Mr. Clay's anxiety to exonerate himself even from the suspicion of being actuated by interested motives in supporting Adams, he has written books, and made many *coalition, lunch, and dinner speeches*, for which he is famous

As he is expected to be in this State soon on the same errand, accompanied by another of the heads of departments, [Gen. Porter] it may be due to those gentlemen to apprize them that they are suspected [Clay as principal, and Porter as agent] of unfair and dishonest efforts to obtain, by bargain and management, one half of the votes of this State for Clay during the last presidential election—that Porter, the agent, in his anxiety to serve his principal, made proposals to the friends of both Crawford and Adams to divide the votes of this State between his principal and them, and that these negotiations were pending *between both* at the same time.

I shall proceed and state the facts and circumstances as they occurred; and in so doing, if I should fall into any errors in the detail, I will thank any individual who will correct me; or if I shall mention the name of any member of the Legislature of 1824, I trust it may not be attributed to any want of respect, but as necessary in giving that truth to the public to which they are entitled, particularly on a subject which so materially affects the parties concerned.

It will be recollected by those familiarly acquainted with the politics of our State in the winter of 1824, that a warm struggle was maintained between the friends of Crawford and Adams, the two prominent candidates for the Presidency. The friends of Crawford, at the commencement of the session of the Legislature, undoubtedly had a majority in this State; but, by ill-devised measures, the leaders of that party became unpopular: still they held a decided majority in joint ballot, over the friends of Adams. Although Jackson and Clay were both candidates, so little was said about either, that, during the session of 1824, no apprehensions were entertained by the friends of Crawford or Adams that the few partisans of Jackson or Clay seriously intended to make an effort to obtain any portion of the voters of this State for their favorites; but, on the contrary, supposed that they would attach themselves to one of the two principal candidates. This belief prevailed until the meeting of the Legislature for the purpose of choosing electors, which took place on the 2d Nov. Gen. Porter arrived in Albany the last of October, and located at the Eagle Tavern, where he was ready to meet the members of the Legislature as they severally arrived. He commenced organizing the friends of Clay, and probably increasing their numbers, which was the more easily effected, as it was allowed that the friends of neither party could give the requisite number of votes to choose electors; and therefore the friends of Clay, by being organized, could control the election As much personal feeling had become enlisted in the controversy between the friends of Adams and Crawford, it was expected that either party would the more readily listen to terms, which, if they did not give them a complete victory, would at least defeat their opponents. On the evening preceding the meeting of the Legislature, a meeting of the friends of Adams and Clay—members of the Legislature who had arrived in Albany—was attended at the Eagle Tavern—where the proposals were first made of uniting the friends of Clay and Adams, and dividing the votes. A more full and general meeting was agreed upon for the next evening, which accordingly took place. After the meeting was organized, General George McClure made some general remarks on the peculiar state of the parties—the importance of uniting the friends of the people—of defeating those who trampled on their rights, &c. and concluded by proposing to give Clay and Adams the votes of the State, equally divided. He was followed by Mr. Ogden of the Senate, who, after occupying some time, closed by offering a resolution for the appointment of a committee, who should select from the several districts of this State suitable persons for electors, one half of whom should be friendly to Henry Clay, and the other to J. Q. Adams. Several other gentlemen addressed the meeting, all assenting to the proposition, altho' assigning different reasons. Mr. Henry Wheaton, a particular friend of Mr. A, was the last and most decided advocate for the measures proposed. He addressed the meeting, and urged an immediate passage of the resolutions, alleging, among other reasons, the ability of the friends of Clay to give the majority to either candidate. One individual addressed the meeting, objecting to the question being taken on the resolution at that time—alleging that it was acting without due deliberation that no necessity existed for such precipitancy—that if a bargain was necessary, Clay had not stock enough to entitle him to half; and finally protesting against being a party to the arrangement. Without going into further detail, the meeting adjourned; and although the proposition was favorably received, a few dissenting voices were sufficient to defeat it, and the final result was therefore doubtful. The

same evening [Tuesday, 2d Nov.] one of the friends of Mr. Clay proposed in the Senate Chamber, when the friends of Crawford had assembled, that in forming an electoral ticket, reference should be had to the interest of Clay. His friend urged that, as there was no probability of a President being chosen by the colleges, they should insist on a few votes, which would enable him to go before Congress; and, if I mistake not, they proposed to be contented with eleven, deeming that number sufficient. Some of Mr. Crawford's friends were disposed to listen to the proposition—others were averse to a divided ticket. The meeting adjourned, no vote being taken on the question. The negotiation was urged, and solicitations to *both parties* for a division of the votes were continued, with great earnestness, for some days—when a written communication from the friends of Mr. Clay was made to the friends of Mr. Crawford, and read in caucus. The contents of this I cannot now repeat. I however recollect that, at the time, I understood it to be a withdrawal of certain individuals from the Crawford party, and declaring their preference for Clay; and formally urging his claim for a portion of electoral votes. The measure was then ascribed to Gen. Porter, whose solicitude and exertions kept pace with the importance of his object. On the 11th of November the Senate nominated electors friendly to Mr Crawford; and the Assembly, [never before able to ascertain who the friends of Clay were, or rather what were their number,] proceeded to ballot for electors, and found the vote to stand as follows: Adams 50; Crawford 43, and Clay 32. On the 11th, Gen. George McClure brought forward a resolution, proposing the same list of electors, at the head of whom was Samuel Young. The friends of Crawford and Adams voted against the adoption. The vote stood 95 to 32. Several similar resolutions were offered by the friends of the other candidates. The result of the votes on which, differed but little from that given on the first ballot.

The friends of Mr. Crawford, finding themselves disappointed in the hopes which they had entertained, that the few honorable and high-minded men who had been seduced by Gen. Porter to abandon their party, would, on a little reflection, see the impropriety of dividing the vote of the State, Mr. Follet of the Assembly, (a decided friend of Mr. Crawford) on the 12th November, introduced a resolution embracing the names of the *Adams* electors previously offered and rejected. He was instantly assailed by the friends of Mr. Clay, and asked if he would finally vote for the names proposed, &c. Mr. Follett explained, and his conduct was justified by Mr. Flagg, who referred to the course pursued by Mr. Clay's friends with great severity. The resolution was laid on the table. Immediately previous to the adjournment, there appeared an anonymous notice calling the friends of Mr. A. together in one of the Committee rooms in the Capitol, at five o'clock in the afternoon. There was a full meeting at the hour appointed. It was organized. On inquiry being made by a member, what the object of the meeting was? or by whom called? no answer was given; and it was about to be adjourned, when a member from New York observed that he understood that the friends of Mr. Clay had appointed a Committee, who he expected were then in waiting in the Capitol, desirous of conferring with the friends of Mr. Adams. The Committee presented themselves, and desired that a Committee should be named by the friends of Mr. Adams, with whom they might confer. This was objected to; but a majority, from motives of courtesy, consented, and a committee was appointed, and retired for a short time. When they returned, they reported that the friends of Mr. Clay had offered nothing new; but renewed their original proposal for half of the votes. The committee was directed to inform the friends of Mr. Clay, that any such proposal was inadmissible. On Monday, the 15th November, Gen Porter called personally on Mr. Flagg, and urged him to postpone the consideration of the resolution offered by Mr. Follet, for a few days, *and meantime see if an arrangement could not be effected.* This request was not complied with, and the resolution was called up the same day, (the 15th) and passed, 62 to 55. This put an end to General Porter's hopes for obtaining by any direct negotiations and bargains, the half the votes of this State for Clay; but efforts to obtain a few votes by indirect means were successfully continued. The result of the final ballotting for electors in this State, excited so much interest at the time as to make it unnecessary for me to refer to it now. My object is to give the facts. The public will draw their own inferences, and be enabled to account for the very extraordinary appointment of Gen. Porter as Secretary of War, and give credit to Mr. Clay for his due share in the transaction.

GENESEE.

The Nashville Republican of the 19th ultimo, contains the following notice:

BURR AND JACKSON.—Reiterated calls have been made on the *Nashville* Committee and *Nashville* Republican, by the Coalition prints, to "*come out*" on the subject of Gen. Jackson's alleged participation in the Burr conspiracy. Sneers, and taunts, and challenges have been used without stint. These we regard not. But we take this opportunity of saying to the friends of Gen. Jackson throughout the Union, that the charge *will* be met—*triumphantly* met. A full expose of Gen. Jackson's acquaintance and connexion with Aaron Burr, will in due time be made, which shall cause his friends to exult, and cover his enemies with shame and confusion—one, that shall show to the American people the utter falsity of the foul charge which has been sought to be fastened on their greatest defender.

A short time ago, a relation of Gen. Wool, of the army, residing near Albany called on him, and demanded a loan of some money. The Gen. refused the loan—and the applicant immediately drew a pistol and attempted to kill him. We have wondered that this attempt to assassinate Gen Wool, has not been charged by the tools of the coalition upon Gen. Jackson. It had as much connexion with the politics of the day, as the flagellation of Dr. Armstrong had, who was chastised by the Messrs Gilchrists for slandering their father, a patriot of the revolution.

When Mr. Adams was in the line of "safe precedent," and advocating the doctrine that *the Administration could do no wrong*, (a doctrine which the Intelligencer *then* combatted, though it has ever since zealously supported it, he was reminded by that press of the homely proverb, "*When we want to beat a dog, it is an easy matter to find a stick.*" So it appears, when a calumny is to be disseminated, it is an easy matter to find witnesses to support it; and the coalition have never lacked them; though, unfortunately for them, all they have cited have been of such questionable veracity, that their slanders have rarely outlived the hour which gave them birth. On Monday last, the Intelligencer breathed nothing but horror at the idea that the Legislature of N. York should alter the electoral law, and give the vote of that State to Gen. Jackson. This measure, it asserted, was to be brought about by Mr. Van Buren, and the editors "had information on which they placed *entire reliance*," that Mr. Van Buren "*had himself written* to that effect." Well, on yesterday, it had more *signs*, which the editors would have us to believe, were full as portentous as those that affrighted *Calphurnia* the night preceding Cæsar's assassination; and they submitted the "*confirmation strong*" of the conspiracy to obtain the vote of New York, elect Jackson, and subvert the Constitution." And what does the reader suppose was this conclusive testimony? Why, an extract from the Cincinnati (Ohio) Gazette, a paper conducted by Charles Hammond, which originated and circulates those foul and detestable slanders against that excellent, aged, and unoffending lady, Mrs. Jackson, and which is sunk to so low an ebb of infamy, that few of the Adams prints now quote it. And yet this is the evidence on which the Intelligencer relies to support its charges — How fallen has this journal become, let its present course speak. We only wonder why *Judge Williams* and *Col. Andrew Erwin*, of Tennessee, have not been resorted to for their certificates on the subject.

The New Hampshire Gazette, published at Portsmouth, in commenting upon the result of the late election in Louisiana, makes the following just remarks:

But the great cause of boasting, according to Daniel Webster's organ, was that Mr. Livingston was defeated, as "*a punishment for the backslidings of thirty years*,"—the "*old sinner*,"—the friend of Jefferson,—of whom this departed patriot spake, so late as 1824, as having been so *useful* a member of the old school of democracy in Congress.—O Daniel! didst thou suppose a single pilgrimage to Monticello, and thy eulogium on the death of this revered apostle of democracy, would cover thy inveterate hatred of his principles, and lead his friends to call thee brother? Nay—thy malignancy towards these democratic *sinners* lies too deeply rooted. Thou didst, in earlier days, accuse this patriot of falsehood and duplicity, and his disciples with "blaspheming Heaven, and mocking it with diabolical gratitude." And by thy craft and double-dealing, ever didst evince thy dire hostility to the rights of those whom thou call'st "*men of yesterday*," and whom thy little scambling, prating Jackall represents "to have th' *effrontry*,—th' *unblushing impudence, to call themselves republicans!*" The rains of Heaven will never bleach the Ethiopian's skin, nor change the leopard's spots,—so neither would an annual pilgrimage of forty years to Monticello's shrine, with pease [not boil'd] within thy shoes, to make thee suffer penance, ever make thee seem, to those who know thee, what thou'rt not, in grain,—a *democrat*. Thou didst once essay, by th' *whitewash* of amalgamation, like Johnny Q. to make the democrats believe thou wast their friend, and like him seemed to join with them, to urge them on, and sang thy parody so technical,—"Our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country." This was ambition's ladder, on which thou didst expect to rise to influence and power, with prospects fair; first to St. James', there to pay thy court to royalty, roving in state, and like thy prototype, to spread thy "god-like" fame in foreign parts, and show them "*immortality*."—Thence under *bragging* Harry, "into line of *precedents so safe*"—and thence ——but "where are now those dreams of greatness?" Blasted in the bud. Corruption, bargaining, intriguing, all exposed; all hopes to sway the sceptre of the Union vanished; where's "our whole country" now? Now thou essay'st to raise th' indignant cries of yankees 'gainst the south, and call those recreants who do not join thee. "New England, the whole New England, and nothing but New England," is the cry, and thy myrmidons denounce the early friends of Jefferson as the old *backsliders* in the days of '98.

The Louisiana Advertiser of the 5th ult. makes the following pungent remarks on one of the *facts* detailed by the present Hon. Secretary of War, in his "New York administration address," which seems to have been considered by Mr. Adams a *prize essay* entitling its author to a reward from the Coalition.

Another lie detected.—None of the addresses published by the Adams conventions, that of Richmond not excepted, contains so many gross falsehoods as that which was lately issued by the Hartford party in New York. Among a thousand other lies, we, in Louisiana, who witnessed all the events of a campaign so vitally interesting to us, were forcibly struck by the unblushing assertion that Governor Claiborne was arrested by order of General Jackson and ignominiously dragged through the streets of New Orleans by an armed force. The people of New Orleans know this to be an absolute falsehood, and we defy any mercenary of the coalition in this City to assert that this calumny of the New York tories has the slightest foundation in fact. This is a sample of the regard which the coalition have for truth—and we fearlessly assert that all the accusations against General Jackson, whenever their inventors have been compelled to give them a local habitation, have turned out to be equally groundless with this charge respecting the alleged arrest of Governor Claiborne.

Town of Greenbush, Rensselaer County.—The meeting of the republicans of Greenbush, was most numerously attended; and the most gratifying zeal and animation in the good cause were manifested. The democracy of Greenbush will shew a proud result at the polls.—*Alb. Argus*

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*, subject to newspaper postage and *no more*.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, SEPTEMBER 13, 1828. No. 27.

For the United States' Telegraph.

TO JOSEPH GALES, ESQ.

Sir: If it be true, as some have alleged, that my language is too plain, and my denunciations too strong, the public must bear with it; for I cannot comprehend that rule which enjoins us to speak one way when we think another; and, indeed, if I could comprehend it, I would not conform to it. I have yet to learn how to make my tongue and soul hypocrites to each other. To the duplicity of the court, where men are taught to speak with "candid tongues," and in set and studied phrases, I am a stranger, and hope ever to remain so. I would not, if I could, divest myself of those principles which I imbibed in the spring time of my life, which have adhered to me through the summer, and still abide with me now, in the autumn of my days—principles which have always impelled me to the cultivation of honest feelings, and the frank and fearless utterance of them. No, sir, I thank fortune, that she has cast my lot in the wholesome and moral atmosphere of the country, among men whose tongues utter only what their hearts feel—plain, blunt, honest farmers,

"Who have not those soft parts of conversation
"That men of intrigue have."

Sir, when I see a man eagerly catching up, and publishing, the malignant tales which idle rumor with her thousand tongues is propagating, and which he knows to be false, too—that man I will call a CALUMNIATOR and a LIAR. When I see him, like the cameleon, changing his hue with every change of the administration, and adapting his shape and character to every change of party, as they alternatively attain to power, I will call him a RENEGADO. When I see him advocating a band of political intriguants, who, by treading on the necks of the people, have stolen into power, and who are now endeavoring, by arts the most vile, to keep the people down, and perpetuate their own dominion, I will call him a TRAITOR. When I see him stealing insidiously on his intended victim—his hideous form wrapped in a cloak of disinterestedness, with a poisoned dagger concealed in its folds, I will cry out, AN ASSASSIN! *beware of him!* When I see him made frantic by the hopelessness of his condition, wielding with desperate hand the flaming torch of discord and disunion, and inciting the people to rebellion, I will lift up my voice, and exclaim, AN INCENDIARY! AN INCENDIARY! Sir, shall we be afraid to speak now—now, when our country demands of us to speak out, even at the hazard of our lives? I know not what others may be disposed to do; but for myself, as I live—

"—— I will speak, liberal as the air;
"Let timid boys, men, and devils, let them all,
"All, all, cry shame against me, yet I'll speak."

Whatever others may think, surely you cannot object to the terms I use, and the epithets I apply; for you know that every fact I state, and almost every argument I employ, in refutation of your slanders on General Jackson, are derived exclusively from your own columns. The epithets are mere inferences, which force themselves irresistibly on the minds of all who read the facts. If I prove conclusively, and by his own testimony, that a man has told a lie, would it be a fault to say, that, therefore, that man is a liar? If it be a fault to employ such terms, then, sir, you are responsible for them; for you have, by your wreckless course, and egregious inconsistency, written them on the minds of all your readers, in characters too deep to be easily erased.

You have engaged a new hand, though an old workman, to toil with you in your laboratory of defamation. It was not necessary, however, that you should expend half a column in vouching for his character; for LACOCK is the man of famous contract memory, well known as the venal Senator, who was universally denounced as a dishonor to his state, and a disgrace to his country. And besides, if he were not so renowned, you ought to have known, that a letter of credit from a man who is notoriously a bankrupt in veracity, always casts a deep shade of suspicion on him whom it is intended to serve. You know that a bad endorser will vitiate a bill which is good in itself—'tis so, too, in politics. You ought, therefore, to have withheld your testimony, for your recommendation will serve a man as little in political traffic, as your endorsement will in mercantile. But if you do not find him a very efficient coadjutor, I am sure he will prove a very willing and zealous one. Avarice is his ruling passion, and so malevolent and revengeful is his temper, that, in confederating with you, he seems only to be fulfilling the designs of nature.—*Par nobile fratrum!*

Lest, however, there may be some who know not this co-slanderer of yours, and may be disposed to allow to his evidence some degree of credit, because of their ignorance of the man, and the mere circumstance of his having been once a Senator, I will apply your own, and his standard of evidence to determine his character, and the motives by which he is influenced in thus assailing the private reputation and public conduct of General Jackson. By your own and his standard of evidence—"I mean rumour not contradicted," "current reports," for you both allege, that the silly story about cutting off Senator's ears, was generally spoken of and not contradicted, and that, therefore, it must be true. To be judged by this test, surely neither of you will object, for you cannot complain of the application to you of that rule which you apply to others. And here I must acknowledge my obligation to you, for furnishing me with this standard of evidence, as I shall find it of great use in the course of my numbers, in delineating the character and motives of one, for whom you feel a deeper interest than you do for Lacock.

Then who is this Abner Lacock? Common

rumor represents him as a man of such inordinate avarice, and such vindictiveness of temper, that all his obligations to his neighbor, his state, and his country, are made subservient to the gratification of those passions—that even the sacredness of a Senator's oath is inadequate to restrain them, and that while in the United States' Senate, he was distinguished only for prostituting the dignity of his office to the advancement of his personal interest, and the gratification of his private resentments. Rumor designated him as the man who abused the confidence of Mr. Monroe, and "purloined from his table a private letter, with a design to use it against General Jackson.

These are the characteristics which all who know him ascribe to him. The black catalogue of specifications which constitute them, were the "common topics of the day," "current reports," and were implicitly believed by all who heard them, and knew the man. Surely, sir, you remember them. Do you not recollect a certain Mr. Orr, between whom and Mr. Lacock there was an intimacy which could in no way be accounted for, except by an identity of interest—that the shadow and the substance were scarcely more inseparable than they were? Do you not remember that this Mr. Orr obtained large contracts for furnishing the army with supplies, and that while he remained in Washington in daily attendance upon the Departments, with Abner Lacock, that Atlas Lacock, THE SON OF ABNER, was engaged as principal agent for procuring and furnishing the provisions? Do you not remember, that when Mr. Orr and his agent, Atlas, the son of Abner, failed to supply Gen. Harrison's army, according to the terms of the contract; that Gen H. ordered his commissaries to purchase provisions and charge the expense to the contractor, giving him credit for the contract price of the ration only—that Mr. Orr and Abner Lacock were active in circulating reports to the injury of General Harrison, and industriously endeavored to create, at the War Department, and elsewhere, an opinion, that he had effected the ruin of Orr to promote his own private interest? Do you not recollect that Abner Lacock remained a considerable time at Washington, after the adjournment of Congress, and by his obsequious and suppliant importunity at the War Department, ultimately prevailed on the Secretary (General Armstrong) to disregard the conditions and penalties of the law, and settle Mr. Orr's account without charging him with the cost of his shameful delinquency, thereby affording to him the benefit of furnishing his rations, during the summer and fall, at an immense profit, and imposing on the government the heavy expense of furnishing supplies during the winter, and, indeed, incurring the danger of starving the army, or leaving the North Western frontier unprotected? Do you not remember, that Mr. Orr, whose chief agent was Atlas, the son of Abner, was thus, through the importunity of Abner, the father of Atlas, relieved from a responsibility of *one hundred and seven thousand dollars*, and that, as if by magic, he became suddenly rich, purchased lots in Washington, and erected splendid buildings—that the same power of enchantment seemed to operate on Abner's circumstances; that the man of very moderate fortune was suddenly metamorphosed into a great speculator in lands and a builder of houses? Do you not remember, that this same Mr. Orr, notwithstanding his failures in his North Western frontier contract, obtained another for supplying General Gaines's army in the expedition against the Seminole Indians, and that the first expedition of that gallant officer was rendered wholly abortive by the failure of the agent Atlas, the son of Abner, to supply his army, and that the government was thereby compelled to incur the expense of the second expedition under General Jackson? Do you not recollect, that General Jackson was too intent on his country's good, and the preservation of the lives of his frontier brethren, to tolerate the abominable frauds and delays of Atlas the agent, or place any reliance on one whose delinquency had nearly starved the army, and cost the government such immense sums, even though that agent was a Senator's son—that he did not stop to consider whether that Senator himself was not interested (sub rosa) in the contract, or what injury he might do him at Washington, by his malignant revenge? Do you not know, that General Jackson, having no confidence in the contractor, or his agent, appealed to the enterprise and patriotism of such men as the gallant Gibson, who now presides with so much credit over the Subsistence Department of the Government—that the Army was supplied—a most perilous expedition completely accomplished, and that since, no Indian tomahawk has been raised in all the South against a white man? Sir, you well recollect the industry of both Lacock and Orr, (an industry which betrayed a personal interest,) in endeavoring to prevent Congress from changing the mode of supplying the Army, as has since been done with such great advantage. You know, that ever since he left the Senate, Lacock's ruling passion has exhibited itself strong in the eager pursuit of public contracts. You remember, too, that, in all his conduct and conversation in relation to General Jackson, he always betrayed a malignancy and vindictiveness of feeling, which awakened and defied conjecture, till the incidents of the Seminole campaign were known. Then, indeed, astonishment at his rancor gave place to derision and contempt for his meanness. He became the common object of scorn and butt of ridicule to all in Washington. They despised his revengeful ravings, and were amused with his dastardly apprehensions. His own state mortified, and indignant at the base and sordid conduct of their Senator—to mark it with reprobation, adopted, on the 27th March, (a few days after his famous report,) by an almost unanimous vote, the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the conduct of Major Gen. Andrew Jackson, in the late war with Great Britain and his savage allies, and in the late *Seminole war*, is marked with energy, skill, and patriotism, not surpassed in the annals of our country; and inasmuch as the approbation of his country is the highest reward that a hero and patriot can receive, they, therefore, approve of the conduct of General Jackson, *and the decision of Congress thereon*; and that the Governor be, and he is hereby requested to present the thanks of this commonwealth to Major General Andrew Jackson, in a manner that he may deem proper on the occasion."

Such, then, is Abner Lacock, whose miserable slanders you publish to the world, and ask the people to credit them. And now, sir, having sketched his character and motives, I will proceed to notice his farrago of idle and arrogant abuse of General Jackson. I will judge it chiefly by facts and opinions stated by yourself, and authentic documents taken from your columns; in the course of which, I will develope another of your glaringly impudent falsehoods.

He begins by a billingsgate attack on the private character and reputation of Gen. Jackson. Speaks of "*his former crimes and errors,*" and "*the deformed and heinous picture of his private life*" But what those "crimes and errors" are, or of what acts or features this "horrid picture" is made up, we are left to conjecture. Nothing is specified—it is sweeping and gratuitous denunciation no specification of his having violated the sanctity of an oath, for the gratification of a mercenary disposition—of his having prostituted his official power and dignity to the indulgence of malevolent private resentments, or of his having abused the confidence of a friend, and stolen from him a letter, for purposes the most base. No, sir, this arrogant and abominable denunciation is belched forth, without a shadow of evidence, either positive or circumstantial, to support it.

But, sir, I am not more surprised at the boldness of his invective, than at the *potency* of his logic. After presenting this horrible picture of General Jackson's private life, he alleges, that, in consideration of his *military services*, the people "passed over his former crimes and errors with impunity, and spread upon them the almost impenetrable mantle of oblivion and forgetfulness." And yet, for these very military services which obtained for him a pardon for the many heinous sins of his private life, he is denounced by you and Mr. Lacock as a traitor and a murderer! Is it not strange, sir, that acts deserving such epithets should expiate former crimes and errors, and wipe from the picture of his private life those hideous and deformed features which before stood upon the canvass in bold relief? In denouncing General Jackson's private life as a "deformed and heinous picture," and his military services (which he says atoned for, and gave impunity to his private offences,) as traitorous and murderous, Mr. Lacock has branded himself a slanderer—let him take either horn of the dilemma—let him writhe and distort himself under the agony of the charge, still it will stick to him, as did the poisoned tunick to the back of Hercules.

But mark, again, what an admirable logician he is. He observes: "*In short, he was before the nation as a military officer merely, and hence it was, that the report made to the Senate, and a similar one to the House of Representatives, was not well received by the people or their Representatives.*" Indeed! Why, what was the subject of the report, and for what was he arraigned before the nation? Was it for offences committed as a Foreign Minister—a Representative in Congress, or a Head of a Department? No, sir, it was for acts done as a military officer, and because he was charged as a *military officer* for alleged *military offences*, Mr. Lacock complains that the report was not well received by the people or their Representatives. Admirable logic! conclusive and triumphant!

After having thus emitted his venom on the private reputation of General Jackson, he calls upon the people to reason with him, and presents himself as the advocate and champion of those murderous savages, who stained our border lines with the blood of our fellow-citizens, and marked it with the smouldering ruins of their huts. He asserts, that it "is certain the white men committed depredations on the Indians, and that *they* retaliated—that the disturbance at length became serious—the Indians were beaten, and fled into the Spanish territories for shelter, perhaps for *protection.*" Here, sir, is a picture highly discreditable to his own government; and even if it be true, Gen. Jackson could have no agency in it. But it is false, and Mr. Lacock knew it. It is a gross and infamous slander on the white men and the nation, for which he ought to be held in universal detestation.

The President, in a communication to Congress on the 25th March, 1818, says, "I lay before Congress all the information in possession of the Executive respecting the war with the Seminoles, and the measures which it has thought proper to adopt, for the safety of our fellow-citizens on the frontier, exposed to their ravages. *The enclosed documents show that the hostilities of this tribe were unprovoked, the offspring of a spirit long cherished and often manifested towards the United States;* and that, in the present instance, it was extending itself to other tribes, and daily assuming a more serious aspect." Now, sir, it is absurd to suppose, that he had not read this message, and the documents accompanying it. He therefore stands convicted of a wilful falsehood, and malicious slander on his own government.

General Jackson is charged with a violation of the constitution, in substituting "volunteers for Militia, and Horsemen for Infantry, and appointing officers to command them." It is true, sir, that he invoked the aid of those gallant men who had accompanied him through the dangers and toils of the Creek war, and who had gathered laurels on the plains of New Orleans, to join him in defending the lives of their frontier brethren; but the appointment of the officers was, in all cases, made by the men thus brought into the field, and sanctioned by the proper authority. This fact is sustained by the deposition of Col. Butler, which deposition Mr. Lacock has read.

In relation to the charge of having substituted volunteers for drafted militia. "Gen. Jackson had to choose between two modes of raising the requisite force; the one productive of pernicious delay, and calculated to ensure ultimate defeat; the other more simple, less expensive, and creative of an army fraught with ardent enterprise, and willing to endure every privation, in giving safety to their brethren of the South. It was a choice between defeat and victory—the full performance of an urgent duty, or the disgrace of the General, and the destruction of his army." He advised the Governor of Tennessee of the measure he had adopted, who not only approved it, but added to his force a company of mounted volunteers. Gen. Harrison, during the late war, was joined by a body of vo-

junteers, led by Col. Johnson; and Governor Shelby authorized him to form them into corps, and appoint such officers as the men might elect. Another body of volunteers, from Ohio, joined Gen. Harrison on the march, for the relief of Fort Wayne, without any authority, and not commissioned by the State Executive. It was volunteers who followed Gen. Jackson into the Creek nation, achieved the victories of Teledega, Emuckfaw, and the Horse Shoe; penetrated the swamps of Florida, covered Mobile from British visitation, defeated Wellington's veterans on the shores of the Mississippi, and saved New Orleans from pollution. Was the raising of volunteers then deemed unconstitutional, or did Congress approve the measure, and make appropriations for paying them? Throughout the whole discussion in the House of Representatives, which continued more than three weeks, not a breath of disapprobation was uttered as to this part of his conduct. Away, then, with the ridiculous charge. Do you imagine that the people will censure Gen. Jackson for doing that which saved the lives of their fellow countrymen, and the money of the government?

But here, too, Mr. Lacock makes a stab at Mr. Monroe, for General Jackson advised the Department of all he had done, and on the 29th January, 1818, the Secretary at War thus writes to him: "Your letters of the 12th and 13th instant are received. The measures you have taken to bring an efficient force into the field, are approved." And again, on the 6th of February: "I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 20th ultimo, and to acquaint you of the *entire approbation of the President*, of all the measures you have adopted to terminate the war with the Indians. The honor of our army, as well as the interest of our country, requires that it should be as speedily terminated as practicable; and the confidence reposed in your skill and promptitude, assures us that peace will be restored on such conditions as will make it honorable and PERMANENT." If, then, this was a violation of the constitution, the President and Cabinet were obnoxious to the charge.

It is alleged, in further support of this charge, that Gen. Jackson employed an Indian force, amounting to about 1800, and that he appointed a Brigadier General, and a vast number of subordinate officers, to command them. Now, sir, Mr. Lacock knows this to be false, and, knowing it to be so, he gives it publicity. He knows that this force was furnished upon a call from Gen. Gaines, and was organized by him, before Gen. Jackson took command of the army. He knows, too, that Gen. Gaines apprised the Department of it, and that it was not disapproved.

Mr. Lacock proceeds—"With this force, forcadded to the regulars, Gen. Jackson and his army, above 4000 strong, marched into the Spanish Territory of Florida, in pursuit of the defeated and fugitive Indians and runaway negroes, whose whole force, if embodied, would not amount to 1000 men." What Mr. Lacock designs to effect by this, it is difficult to imagine. General Jackson was fighting for his country, not for fame. Throughout his whole life, his motto has been, "*pro patria.*" In every glorious achievement in which he has been concerned, he has been assiduous in disclaiming merit for himself, and ascribing it to others; and if, at any period of his life, he had been capable of hazarding the interest of his country, and the lives of his fellow-citizens, to gratify his ambition, the motive must have been inoperative then; for then his brows were covered with laurels, and there was a halo of lustre about him, which nothing could render more effulgent. Yet here, too, as in all his other charges, Mr. Lacock was not disposed to inquire into the fact, or if he did, he was not disposed to speak the truth; for you, yourself, on the 5th March, 1818, says, that information has been received, that the Seminoles and Creeks are 4000 warriors strong; that they have destroyed their towns, placed their women and children, stock and provisions, in a fortified camp, situated in the midst of an immense and almost impassable marsh." But whether it be true or not, what will the people think of the modesty of Mr. Lacock's demand upon them? viz: to censure General Jackson for taking with him a force which he thought would ensure a victory!

But it seems that Gen. Jackson in his mad ambition, usurped the power of Congress, and declared war by the invasion of Florida, and that he defied and disobeyed the orders of the President by the capture of St. Marks and Pensacola. Mr. Lacock is peculiarly unfortunate in all his assaults on Gen. Jackson, for every thrust he aims at him, misses his object and strikes the President. You are aware Sir, that Gen. Gaines was empowered in repeated orders to cross the line, and that the continued indiscriminate and bloody slaughter of old men, women and children—the desolation of our borders, with fire and the tomahawk, could not have been prevented or avenged, without pursuing those ruthless savages into their very fastnesses, where they lay in imagined security, like the Anaconda, gorged with the blood of our fellow-citizens. Why Sir, to have protected our citizens without crossing the line, would have required a force of 100,000 instead of 4,000 of which Mr Lacock complains. But it is not my purpose to demonstrate the expediency of the act, it is sufficient if I prove, that it was authorized.

The depredations of those monsters, had become so terrible, and the means resorted to, so inadequate to prevent them, that the Government under those disastrous circumstances, had recourse to the well established energy and talents of Jackson; and although he had fought with the veterans of Europe, and conquered them; yet at the call of his country, he repaired with alacrity to the post of danger, with a mere handful of men, to combat with a dispicable and treacherous savage foe. Sir, he has never refused a call of his country, when *honorable* service could be rendered, and he never disappointed the high expectations which his well tried patriotism and wisdom, inspired the nation with.

So great was the confidence which the Government reposed in him, that the first order they gave him, commanded him in terms positive, to invade Florida, and vested him with a *discretion* as to ulterior operations. It informed him that Gen Gaines, under his command, had been ordered "to penetrate from Amelia Island, *through Florida* to the Seminole towns," and directs him to "concentrate his force, and *adopt the necessary measures to terminate the conflict.*" Can there be a doubt sir, that the terms of this

order vested him with a discretion? What, "the necessary measures to terminate the conflict" were, are not detailed. It is manifest that they were only to be ascertained and determined by circumstances to be developed in the prosecution of the war; what, therefore, appeared to Gen. Jackson, necessary to this object, he was not only authorized, but bound to adopt; that it was designed by the Department itself, that this construction should be given it, is evident from the Secretary of War's letter to Governor Bibb on the 13th May, 1818, wherein he says: "*General Jackson is vested with full powers to conduct the war in the manner he may judge best.*" The President in his message to Congress, on the 25th March, 1818, says that Gen. Jackson "was ordered to the theatre of action, charged with the management of the war, and vested with the powers necessary to give it effect." It is true, however, he states that "orders have been given to the General in command, to respect the Spanish authority, *wherever it is maintained*," but in the same message asserts that, that authority is no where maintained; he says: "as almost the whole of this tribe inhabits the country within the limits of Florida, Spain was bound, by the treaty of 1795, to restrain them from committing hostilities against the United States. We have seen with regret that her government has altogether failed to fulfil this obligation, nor are we aware that it made an effort to that effect. When we consider her utter inability to check, even in the slightest degree, the movements of this tribe, by her very small and incompetent force in Florida, we are not disposed to ascribe the failure to any other cause. The inability however of Spain to maintain her authority, over the territory and Indians within her limits, and in consequence to fulfil the treaty, ought not to expose the United States, to other and greater injuries. When the authority of Spain ceases to exist, then the United States have a right to pursue their enemy on a principle of self defence. In this instance the right is more complete and obvious, because we shall perform only what Spain was bound to perform herself. *To the high obligation and privileges of this great and sacred right of self defence, will the movements of our troops be strictly confined.*" And in his message at the commencement of the session in 1818, he says that in the prosecution of the war "facts were disclosed respecting the conduct of the officers of Spain, in authority there, in encouraging the war, furnishing munitions of war, and other supplies, to carry it on, and in other acts not less marked, which evinced their participation in the hostile purpose of that combination, and justified the confidence with which it inspired the savages—that by those officers they would be protected." Now, Sir, I challenge any candid man, to read this evidence, and arrive at any other conclusion, than that, General Jackson was not only authorized, but bound to invade Florida, and take possession of St. Marks and Pensacola.

But lest you and Mr. Lacock may question the evidence I have adduced, I will present you with that, which you will have some difficulty in denying. Mr. Lacock himself, says that the Indians "fled into the Spanish territory for shelter and *protection*," and you Sir, on the 19th September, 1818, tell us "that the post of St. Marks is a military post, remote from any population, surrounded by hordes of desperate Indians and negroes; it is the only barrier against their ravages and incursions. To evacuate it on the mere demand of any Spanish agent, deputed to receive, or to a force incompetent to hold it, would be to evacuate it to the Indians; for we have the authority of the late Spanish commander of it, for saying that the Indians controlled him, and not he them. Self preservation is the first dictate of nature; and there is nothing in the law of nations, most rigorously construed, which requires a nation to prostrate any part of its population, at the mercy of an infuriated and savage enemy. We have daily accounts, that the Seminole Indians remaining unsubdued are embodied in full; this check withdrawn, and they might sweep our borders." And again on the 23d of June, 1818, you say—"If the Indians in arms against us, led the way to Pensacola, there can be no doubt of General Jackson's being justified in following and dislodging them." Now Sir, you have the deposition of Col. Butler, which states "that General Jackson received information at St. Marks that, there were about six hundred hostile Indians at Pensacola, who received ammunition and provisions from the government.

Would it be believed, after all this Sir, that you could be so regardless of the truth—so reckless of reputation, as to assert, on the 17th ult. that you "never did agree with Mr. Adams on the subject of the Seminole war!" And yet, as incredible as it may appear, it is nevertheless true, that you did assert this most daring and detestable falsehood. Oh impudence, thy name is Joseph Gales!!*

If Mr. Munroe was justified by Congress, the country and yourself, for the capture of Amelia Island from a few European adventurers, with a view to prevent some slight embarrassment to our commerce—surely, he will not be censured for taking possession of Florida from a band of desperate runaway negroes, and infuriated savages, with a view to prevent the horrid massacre of our fellow citizens.

I must here notice, a piece of disgraceful disingenuousness on the part of Lacock, eminently worthy of him. He asserts that the "President ordered the line to be crossed, if necessary, but especially directed, that if the Indians took refuge under a Spanish fort, not to disturb them, but to report the facts to the Department of War." It is plain that he here designs, that the public shall understand that such an order was given to Gen. Jackson. Yes Sir, he evidently designs that this impression shall be made, although he knows it to be false. Such an order might possibly have been given to Gen. Gaines, but none such was ever issued to Gen. Jackson, and even if the orders given to Gen. Gaines before Gen. Jackson took the command

---

* Here I admit myself guilty of plagiarism—this beautiful and sublime exclamation, is borrowed from Mr. Gales, who, on the 28th ultimo. when speaking of the inconsistency of the Richmond Enquirer, in a paroxysm of poetic inspiration, exclaims

"*Oh Fickleness thy abode is Richmond!*"

But I believe that Mr. Gales may be convicted too, of a literary theft, for Shakspeare says,

"Oh Frailty, thy name is Woman!"

were binding on him, this order (if such was given) was completely abrogated by the orders which Gen. Jackson subsequently received from the Department. The meanness of this attempt, is so glaring, and the design in itself, so disgraceful to our friend Abner, that I could not make the one *more* manifest, or increase the measure of the other, by any thing that I could add.

Sir, I designed when I commenced this, to take some notice of Lacock's Lamentations on the death of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, and Francis and Hoomocheco; and of his dastardly fears and *foamings* about the silly story of Gen. Jackson's threats—but I am tired sir—really so tired that I have not inclination to revise this letter. I will perhaps advert to them, in some of my subsequent numbers, when I will add to his title of Base Slanderer, that of Pitiful Poltroon.

A MARYLAND FARMER.

For the United States Telegraph.

TO JOSEPH GALES, ESQ.

Sir: It is a beneficent order of Providence, that a man with great depravity of heart, seldom possesses that skill and discretion necessary to the accomplishment of his designs. The perjurer betrays his guilt, by his efforts to conceal it. The assassin excites suspicion, and defeats his own purpose, by his stealthy pace; and the brazen visor which the Liar puts on for concealment, often proves the cause of his detection. Thus the very means which man resorts to, as auxiliaries to his baseness, are converted by Providence into instruments of his exposure and punishment.—Do you want examples, sir? Your own history abounds with them. You will encounter no difficulty in the search, for so recently as the 12th inst. you present an illustration, clear and conclusive.

You doubtless imagined that you had played off upon the public a very ingenious trick, when you alleged that "a Jackson friend in a neighboring public office" had requested you, in "an anonymous letter," to publish the evidence I adduced to convict you of a wicked and impudent falsehood. But, sir, if you had possessed common sagacity, you would have known, that the veriest tyro would detect the paltry artifice, and despise the poltroon principle which could induce a resort to it. It was indeed a contemptible trick, and cruel as contemptible—it was contemptible, because it was false without being artful; and it was cruel, because it was designed to call down upon the clerks an unprovoked vengeance, which would involve in its impoverishing influence their wives and children.

I knew that conscience had ceased to exert an influence over you, yet I did suppose that you had adroitness enough to avoid an expedient, the mendacity of which, must be apparent to your most unintelligent reader. It seems, however, that I gave you credit for more talents than you possess. The difficulties of the crisis have tested them, and proved that, with the disposition to play the caitiff, you have not the art to do it successfully. The summer's sea, on which you have been so long and so buoyantly swimming, is now tossed by a terrible tempest, and you are too weak to buffet it. Your road, heretofore, has been so plainly marked, that you could not miss your way, and no temptation has assailed you strong enough to divert you from it: hence you acquired a *fictitious reputation*, which is now your only resource. But, Sir, this will no longer avail you. I have dragged you from behind that barrier of mock dignity, which your "high blown pride" had erected, and where, like a coward, you had entrenched yourself; and be assured, that, before we part, I will tear from your back the lion's skin in which you have so long been enveloped; and exhibit you to the nation as a mere braying ass.

You had been so much favored by a blind fortune, and pampered by successive administrations, that many who had not the industry to investigate or the intelligence to comprehend, believed that you really had some merit, and were disposed to allow to your opinions some degree of influence. You grew vain, and attributed to your own skill that for which you were indebted to accident exclusively. I had been content to remain silent, and suffer you to swell and strut in your imagined importance, and enjoy your bloated reputation, while that influence which a too credulous party had invested you with, had not been exerted to distract and ruin a free and happy people; and even now I engage in the work of disrobing you with unfeigned reluctance, and shall pursue it with unaffected pain. I lament the necessity while I yield to its force.

The panther's cry in imitation of the wailings of a child, excites no alarm when all know the source from whence it proceeds; but, when the unwary, deceived by the artifice, are hastening to the supposed rescue, we are irresistibly impelled to interpose, and tell them that it is a monster who allures, only to destroy. We can view without trepidation, the child caressing his lap dog, and amused with his playfulness—but, when we see the pet with frenzied eye and slavered jaws, ready to seize the hand which fed, and tear the bosom which caressed it, we are involuntarily constrained to cry aloud in our terror, and warn the careless victim of his danger.

Sir, you came among us from a foreign land. Whether you were actuated by a spirit of enterprise, or driven by the retributive vengeance of offended laws, we inquired not. We received you with that feeling which distinguishes a generous people—a bold and unsuspecting confidence. We spread over you, for your own protection, the mantle of our laws, and offered to your enterprise and your industry, all the resources of our land. With what success you availed yourself of these advantages, let your former history testify. With what black ingratitude you abused them, your recent conduct bears lamentable evidence.

The paper which you know conduct was, when under the auspices of your predecessor, adopted by the Republican party as their organ. After the battle had been fought, the victory won, and the power of the party established on a basis so sure as to require but little talent or effort to sustain it, you succeeded to the control of it. They desired only to disseminate knowledge among the people to give them but light. To this purpose, fidelity and a moderate degree of industry alone were necessary. It was supposed that you possessed these, and they gave you their countenance. They raised you from obscurity to eminence,—from poverty to affluence—they cherished you long, and bestowed on you their patronage with a liberal spirit.—For a con-

siderable period the ascendancy of the party remained uncontested, and no circumstance transpired to test your principles, or develope your baseness; during the while you rioted in their favors, and derived a bloated consequence from their support. Sir, how did you repay their kindness? When the enemy, disguised as a friend, stole into our camp, and by his arts spread distraction in our ranks, did you stand firm, and bravely fight in our cause? Did you endeavor to repel the invader? Or did you, seduced by his power to compensate, prove recreant to your trust, and basely desert us? Ay, sir, you did more—you exerted the very power which we gave you, for our destruction—you strove, with a fiend-like spirit, to stab the bosom that warmed you into life; and you are now laboring, with frantic zeal, to array in deadly hostility the North against the South, and spread over this happy land which afforded you an asylum, an universal death!

Sir, you present a picture more revolting than that of the unnatural son, smiting, with mortal intent, the bosom of his mother.—His, is the result of defective organization, or frenzy produced by disease: *your's*, the deliberate and hellish spirit of the arch-fiend, afraid to make the onset boldly, but striving by exasperation to entrap, that you may slay the more securely.—He, is furiously impelled by madness without a motive—*you*, are deliberately incited by the base hope of pecuniary reward. The tale is so unnatural, that it would be rejected as incredible, were it not for the weight of irresistible evidence to sustain it.

You advocated the interest of the South and the Southern policy—was engaged in a warm controversy with M. Carey, the great champion of the tariff system; and you alleged in 1823, that he manufacturing community was the only prosperous community in the country, and that it was pampered at the expense of the already starving Agricultural and Commercial interests of the nation. You lauded all the acts of Gen. Jackson, and defended him with great zeal against the malignant aspersions of his *personal* foes. You denounced Mr. Clay as one, to whom you could never give your support, and asserted that he knew it too. You charged Mr. Adams with possessing and advocating monarchical principles, and assailed him with a spirit indicative of personal as well as political hatred. You did all this, sir, 'till the usurpers consummated their plot, and brandished before you the pap-spoon of the Treasury—then, like a base Judean, you threw your former friends and principles away,—and, to cram your hungry maw, engaged in the work of defaming your friends and distracting the country.

Sir, I intended when I took up my pen to prove all this, out of your own mouth, and to demonstrate that, in your effort on the 12th inst. to wipe from your forehead the hideous mark which I had fixed there, you only rivetted it the firmer; but I shall be too late for the post. In my next "I will a round unvarnished tale deliver," and like Acteon, who was chased by his own dogs and devoured, you shall be pursued by a pack of your own opinions, and overwhelmed.

A MARYLAND FARMER.

For the United States Telegraph.

TO JOSEPH GALES, ESQ.

Sir:—It often happens that an incident trifling in itself, gives a direction to a man's whole future course, and controls his destiny. His gradations in vice, although sometimes imperceptible, are almost always certain. Impunity gives encouragement, and detection destroys restraint. Conscience, once deposed, seldom regains its hold on the helm of man's life. He dashes on the sea of infamy, reckless of the rocks and whirlpools which beset his way, and unless a power more than human interposes for his safety, suffers unavoidable shipwreck. Sir, you have launched your bark upon this perilous sea—you have degraded conscience, and shut your eyes upon the polar star of truth—and you are fast hastening to that terrible doom, which, without the intervention of a superhuman effort, is inevitable.

Although your present state of remorseless depravity, excites in me feelings of the deepest indignation, yet I frankly confess that, in the contemplation of the events which led to it, I cannot resist the emotions of pity. I saw you shamefully abusing the prodigal munificence of the party which sustained you—indulging in a course of pomp and profligacy, believing that the favors of fortune which you had so long enjoyed, and without an effort too, would be eternal. I knew that the day of trial would come, and I trembled for the issue—that day of trial, that fatal day did indeed come—and then ensued the conflict between avarice and honesty. I watched the alternate indications with anxious interest. I was aware that in your feelings of pride, habits of extravagance, and embarrassed condition, avarice would find most powerful auxiliaries; yet I knew, too, that there were men who would rather be "steep'd in in poverty to the very lips" than yield to its dominion, and I hoped that you might prove yourself such a man—but, how vain the hope! You surrendered at discretion; but with a reluctance which seemed to say, "My poverty, but not my will, consents."

Yes, Sir, all your public acts, your whole political course, and every consideration of consistency, urged you to advocate the people's cause, and to resist with all your might the usurpations of Messrs. Adams and Clay: but your private profligacy had imposed upon you necessities which you had not virtue enough to resist, and doomed you to a state of wretched servitude in the cause of those whom you had formerly abused. Mr Clay had practised upon you his seductive arts, before; he had endeavoured to persuade you to unite with him in opposition to Mr. Monroe's administration; but he was deficient in that power which alone could induce you to yield—the power of compensating. You were not willing to take his promises, dependent upon an issue by no means certain; and acting upon that discreet maxim, not to forego a certain advantage for that which was doubtful, you resisted his wiles, and adhered to that party, of whose power to reward you were well assured. Provoked by your servility, and exasperated at his failure, Mr Clay publicly assailed you in the [illegible] and charged you with a [illegible] influence upon those who distributed "*treasury pap.*" His contempt of you, and your hostility to him, were open and undisguised. Your partner declared to Colonel Johnson, in the Senate Chamber, that "*Mr. Clay had no friendly feelings to*

wards you, and NEVER *could have; that you knew Mr. Clay too well,* AND MR CLAY KNEW THIS FACT TOO WELL, EVER TO BE YOUR FRIEND."

In your controversy with Mr. Adams in 1824, you assailed him with charges of such a character as to render a support of him impossible, unless at the sacrifice of every honorable feeling. You denounced the sentiments he avowed, and the principles he advocated, as "MONARCHICAL NOTIONS," "ANTI-REPUBLICAN DOCTRINES," "NEW DOCTRINES," "ULTRA DOCTRINES," and endeavored to provoke him with your *sneers* and contemptuous manner. On the 14th Aug. 1824, in reply to Mr. Adams, you say: "*This disingenuousness is of a piece with all the treatment we have received from the party,* AND WE EXPECT FROM THEM NO BETTER. *It is to be feared that they have not even grace enough to blush at the detection of their sophistry.*" And the whole controversy is marked by an asperity so bitter, and a hatred so deep and fixed, as to banish for ever, all hope of a reconciliation.

Such was the relation in which you stood towards Messrs. Adams and Clay. How different was the attitude in which you stood towards Gen. Jackson! His whole official conduct you had not only approved, but praised; when assailed, you stood forth and defended him with an ardor which bespoke your admiration of his character and his talents, and against him never did you utter a word of censure or disapprobation. Sir, I repeat it, *never, no, never did you permit a word of objection against Gen. Jackson to escape you, until you lost the printing of the Senate!*

With this view of the case, an honest man would deem it an insult to his understanding, to be asked whom you would advocate, and what course you would pursue? He would not be able to conceive how political preferences, and private regards, such as you had manifested for Gen. Jackson, could, without even a shadow of justification, be discarded—he would not be able to comprehend the art of *now*, lauding a man for his acts in terms of the highest admiration, and defending him with a zeal indicative of the warmest friendship—and *then*, for the very same acts, assailing him in the language of vulgar and vituperative abuse, and with a rancor denoting the most venomous hostility! In vain would he try to believe it possible, that political aversion and personal animosities, such as you had exhibited towards Messrs. Adams and Clay, could, without some show of reason, be subdued; and that the men whom you had boldly denounced and defied to their very beards, and sneered at contemptuously, could become the idols of your homage, before whom you would bow down with obsequious flattery and fawning supplication! No, sir, he would be indignant at the supposition; and declare, there were none so base! But let him trace your history a little farther—his doubts will vanish: and, with me, he will lament, that a man should, by his pride and profligacy, create necessities so strong, as to make all the obligations of honor, of morality, and religion, subservient to them.

Even after you had yielded yourself up to this dire necessity, some gleams of remorse, some flickerings of conscience, would occasionally show themselves, and a blush of shame, in spite of your efforts to conceal it, would flit across your sheet. It gave to your friends a faint hope, that there was some honor still abiding with you. But this hope was of brief duration: for, on the 10th of October, '27, it fled shrieking away, when, with the desperation of a convicted caitiff, YOU BOLDLY CONFESSED, THAT YOU HAD WILFULLY SHUT YOUR EYES UPON THE TRUTH!

> "Why should honor outlive honesty?
> Let it go all!"

Then, the gleamings of departed conscience shone out their last—then, you cast away the innocent flower, and exposed the serpent that lurked beneath it—you shut up the passage to remorse, and determined that no compunctious visitings of nature, should shake your fell purpose. We saw no more of the timid culprit, starting and blushing at every step in infamy, or the trembling assassin, willing to stab, yet afraid to strike—but the brazen-faced calumniator stood forth, with the hideous mark of Liar on his forehead, fixed there by his own confession, resolved to lie on without blushing!

Sir, it would have been better—infinitely better, for you to have continued to avail yourself of the plea of *having wilfully lied*, than to have attempted, as you did on the 12th inst. a justification whereby you exposed your guilt by your efforts to conceal it; and in your struggle to avoid the odium of one lie, not only convicted yourself of that, but incurred the crime of others. I have already spoken of the pitiful and mendacious expedient you resorted to, that you might notice the charge; and I will now show, that as pitiful as it is, it is not as much so as the argument you use to acquit yourself. But "it is to be feared that you have not even grace enough to blush at the detection of your sophistry."

You asserted that the execution of Arbuthnot and Ambrister was a scene of blood and carnage, which you could not look upon with composure, and that you expressed your horror at the transaction, at the time of it.—I pronounced it to be an odious, wicked lie, and demanded of you to produce one article, one sentence, yea, even one word to sustain it; and promised that, if you did, I would publicly confess that I had wronged you. I told you I had searched your columns for evidence, and gave you the following extract, as going as far to sustain your declaration as any thing you had written on the subject:

'We are bound to presume that these facts 'were *proved*; for Arbuthnot and Ambrister 'were tried before a Court Martial, of which 'the discreet and gallant Gaines was President, 'and composed of officers of the highest cha-'racter and standing. The sentence was ap-'proved by Jackson, whose humanity, as well 'as his valor, has often been tested; from 'which character the energy that distinguishes 'his conduct surely cannot detract. If we had 'known nothing of Gen. Jackson's character 'before, the generous indignation he manifest-'ed at the unwarranted destruction of Chehaw, 'interposes between him and the charge of 'cruelty. It has been said that Gen. Jackson 'ought to have awaited the decision of the Pre-'sident on the fate of his prisoners. On this 'head the law has placed in the hands of Gen. 'Jackson a discretionary power, and if he be-'lieved it proper, and it might have been neces-'sary, perhaps, to the safety of his army, it wa

'This duty to carry into effect a sentence intend-'ed to operate more as an example than a pun-'ishment.'—*Nat. Int.* 19*th June*, 1818.

Sir, you felt the charge, and felt it keenly, too. Look at your miserable efforts to evade it—and blush, if blush you can, at the glaring falsehoods and sophistry you have indulged in.

You *pretended* to comply with the request of a "*Jackson friend*" to publish the extract, and then availed yourself of the circumstance to make *explanations*, which you thought might, in the opinion of some, acquit you of the charge. You state that Gen. Jackson was assailed for the act, and that you endeavored to avert the rising sentiment against him, and ask—

"And how did we do it? Did we justify a cruel and sanguinary disposition in him? No: we sought out the case of generous indignation once exhibited by him, and we turned it to good account by considering it as warding off the imputation of cruelty of character."

Why it was never alleged that you justified a sanguinary disposition in him—for in all your remarks in relation to his character and his conduct, you ascribe exactly the reverse to him. But, Sir, will it not require a more than ordinary effort to believe, that this act, which, in 1818, and which you now style an act of "*generous indignation*," and which you used to ward off the charge of cruelty of character; that this very act is, on the 13th of Aug. 1827, urged by you as a crime of a most serious nature, and as exhibiting in Gen. Jackson, a temper at which you shuddered! Ay, Sir, as strange as it may appear, 'tis true. Turn to your sheet of that day, and the fact will stare you in the face, and drive the natural ruby from your cheeks. Thus, like a perjured criminal, whose dreadful apprehensions overpower his memory, in your blind and convulsive struggle to escape one charge, you encounter another more appalling.

You proceed, and say: "In regard to the particular question at issue, we said, that if it was *necessary to the safety of his army*, it was justifiable. And this was *all* that we could say in favor of it." And then, having very modestly *assumed* this, you proceed to discuss the question, whether it was or was not necessary to the safety of his army? Now, Sir, this is downright lunacy. It is not only not *all*, but *nothing* that you did say. You said that "if he believed it *proper*, it was his duty to carry into effect the sentence." And all that is said about its being necessary to the safety of his army, is a mere conjectural reason of your own, superadded to the other, which was in your opinion sufficient to justify the act. Read it, and say if, by the most forced construction, it can be made to mean what you assert. Supply all that you can possibly contend to be understood, and you make nonsense of it. "If he believed it proper, and (if he believed) it might have been necessary perhaps, to the safety of his army, it was, &c." Why, Sir, if you had any pride of literature at all, you would be offended that any should ascribe such unmeaning stuff to you. You *presume* too much upon the ignorance of your readers.

Yet this is not all. You exhibit, in the following sentence, taken from the same article, an instance of bold and dauntless dishonesty, which has no parallel.

"We well remember that, on the first glance at the proceedings of that tribunal which doomed those *luckless* foreigners, we briefly noticed the subject in this paper, expressing our *disgust* at them, saying (*in these or equivalent words,*) If this be military law, Heaven long preserve us from being subject to its sway!"

Now, Sir, if you had been honest, and designed not to impose upon the people, why did you not give the very words of the declaration to which you here advert, and the day on which you made it, that they might construe it themselves, and not take your sense of it, or what you deemed an "*equivalent*" meaning? Is your reputation of so little value, that you will not take the trouble to refer to your columns and give proof to sustain it? Or do you deem yourself of such mighty consequence, that if you but assert it, it will be believed? No, Sir, you were conscious of your guilt, and had no remedy, but to hazard another lie, in the desperate hope that some credulous creature would believe you.

I will, however, deal fairer with the people. I will give them the declaration itself, and let them judge. It was made on the 9th of December, 1818, the day on which you published the proceedings of the Court Martial. Here it is! "With respect to the evidence before the Court, in this case, our respect for the character of the Officers composing it, obliges us, little conversant as we have professed to be, (and may we ever be!) with military law, '*to presume it was such as that law admits*, and this is *all* we shall say of it." And then, Sir, in the very same article, apprehending that some doubt may arise as to the propriety of the *proceedings of the Court*, you proceed to justify the *execution* on another plea, and say—"On the principle of *retaliation* recognised by all nations, these persons we conceive might have been lawfully put to death. They had identified themselves with the Indians; and though claiming to be British subjects, did not prove themselves to be such; and were, according to our doctrine on the subject of allegiance, actually expatriated. The military practices of Indians, contrary to the laws of war, the commanding general had a clear right to retaliate. He did so in the case of the Indian chiefs, and he might have done so in the case of Arbuthnot and Ambrister."

On the 11th of December, '18, you defend him on the same plea, and in relation to the objections which may be made to the proceedings of the Court, you allege that it is stated that Gen. Jackson designed that the Court should only ascertain the facts, and that it was upon the facts, thus ascertained, that he acted.

On the 29th of December, you invite the attention of your readers to an able article in vindication of Gen. Jackson, copied from the Eastern Argus, and observe: "This article distinctly exhibits the proceeding, not as a trial before a Court Martial, but an exercise of power, inherent in every commanding general in the field, on facts ascertained to his satisfaction by a jury, rather than a court of officers summoned for that purpose. In this view of the case, though we do not cease to wish the occurrence (trial) had never taken place, the *legal* objections to it are greatly lessened, *if not entirely obviated.* It is one of the least of the grounds of our regret, in regard to this trans-

riction, that it has, as we foresaw it would, been seized on as the means of producing an impression on the public mind, unfavorable to his character, *by those who had reasons for disliking Gen. Jackson of an earlier date than the Seminole war.*" Where now is the DISGUST—where the HORROR—where is the scene of blood and carnage which made you shudder, and burst forth in such awful ejaculations to Heaven?—Where are they? Can you see them? "Then for pity's sake, show them to me. For [illegible] ally weary in searching for them. [illegible] you will see more horror in this exp[illegible], than you did in the execution of these savage incendiaries!

But again, on the 12th inst. you say: "From that day to this," no expression of approbation of the manner of the execution of Arbuthnot, has ever been heard from us." Why, Sir, no charge of this kind was alleged against you. You had declared, that at the time of the execution, you had expressed your *disapprobation and disgust* at it. This I asserted to be false, and challenged you to the proof, and thus you plead to it. But are you seriously anxious to make your readers believe that you did disapprove of it? Although you really seem to be, I can hardly believe it: for admitting that you did, what can you possibly accomplish by it? None, I am sure, will concur with you in the opinon. But as you seem desirous they should think so, I will annex a few remarks, taken from your columns. On the 4th of June, 1818, I find the following—"In viewing the end of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, the mind can experience no other sensation than complacency, that guilt so full, so unexampled as theirs, has received its merited punishment. And, indeed, what pity do they deserve, who, born and educated in the bosom of civilized society, have identified themselves with cannibals, thirsting after human blood! who could excite, applaud, and recompense their deeds of ferocity!"

On the 5th of June, 1818—"The commander of the *blacks* (Ambrister), an Englishman who had served as an engineer under *Colonel Nichols*, was taken, tried by a court martial, and shot—Arbuthnot was hung on the 24th of April."

On the 19th June, 1818, you say: "In regard to these executions, then, our information extends only to the fact that two Indians, the perpetual foes to the American race, and who are said to have violated every obligation of nature or of law, by savage treachery, were hung by Gen. Jackson, and that two white persons were tried by a court martial, and punished with death, on charges of treachery and deliberate incitement of the savages to acts of barbarity. We have not the official announciation of these facts; neither the proceedings of the court martial, before whom the latter were tried. *But we have enough to certify us, that these persons, if guilty of the offences alleged against them, merited their fate.* * * * * We can well conceive, that a painful feeling might be awakened in the breasts of many, nay, most of our readers, on hearing these circumstances. The feeling is natural. The miserable wretch, whose life is forfeit to the laws for the offence of horse stealing or highway robbery, is not launched into eternity without commiseration. We would at that moment save him if we could But in the highest excitement of that feeling, who ever censured the jury that decided, or the Judge who pronounced the law, or the officer of the court, whose unfortunate duty it was to see it executed? Yet the degree of the crime thus atoned bears no proportion to the enormity of that, of which he is guilty, who educates a whole tribe to murder and rapine; puts the instruments into their hands, and even heads the bands which have slaughtered our fathers, brothers, wives, and helpless infants. *Their crime was horrible if proved, and the measure of justice not overleaped!!*"

On the 17th October, '18, you say. "The war, with all its horrid consequences, is imputable then to his (Arbuthnot's) interference. Whatever may have been his motives, he has perished amidst the massacre and conflagration which he instigated."

These are but a few of the remarks in your paper on this subject. It has never, I believe, been asserted by any one, that these men were not guilty of the crimes for which they suffered. and if you can derive any pleasure from inducing the public to believe that you expressed disapprobation and disgust at the execution of these "LUCKLESS FOREIGNERS,"—why, Sir, enjoy it—I would not rob you of a gratification of that kind!

You further say, on the 12th inst. "We consider the whole proceeding as having been contrary to the spirit of this government and of this people." Sir, you did not entertain this opinion when you published the President's message in 1818, which justified, in the strongest terms, and to the fullest extent, General Jackson's conduct in the Seminole war; for in relation to that message, and with direct reference to this subject, you say on the 21st of November, "we may safely say, after the exposition thus officially given, the course of this government stands on that vantage ground of justice and security, which we hope it will always occupy in its relations with foreign powers."

Again, you say: "It was this incident, with some others which occurred about the same time, that awakened a feeling in regard to Gen. Jackson, which gave us great pain, though it did not diminish your (our) disposition to look upon him, and whatever he did, with a favorable eye." I confess, Sir, that I have endeavored, in vain, to comprehend this. You asserted, but a few days ago, that it was an act, which, from your inability to look on blood and carnage with composure, you could not contemplate without feelings of horror, and that, "*at the time of it*," you expressed your *objection* to it. And in the sentence immediately preceding it, you say—"we briefly noticed the subject (at the time) in this paper, expressing our *disgust*, &c This is looking upon it with a favorable eye, "with a vengeance!" How you could thus look upon it, and express your horror and disgust at it, is a question beyond my capacity to solve. It was doubtless an *erratum*: for *expressed* we should read *suppressed*.

But it seems that you continued "to feel towards Gen. Jackson this favorable disposition as long as he was a private man. But when he came to be proposed as a candidate for the Presidency, you (we) felt a surprise great as, &c. Here, sir, is evidently another mistake. Your memory fails you. It was not when Gen. Jackson was proposed for the Presidency, that you

felt surprise. It was when you lost the printing to the Senate—it was then, Sir,—then that you were "*electrified!*" it was then that with "sorrow's eye, glazed with blinding tears," you expressed your surprise in strains so doleful as to make "e'en angels weep." Surely you remember that Gen. Jackson was a candidate for the Presidency in 1824, and never until that fatal election in the Senate, which occurred in 1827, did you even whisper a word of objection to his temper, his acts, or his qualifications!

What mighty miracles did that election work! It turned complacency to honor, honey to gall, fond love to deadly hate—day into night! Oh, 'twas indeed a terrible event! Never shall it "part from my heart; whene'er I would be sad, I think of it."

Now, seriously, Sir, do you not think it would have been better, to have confessed, as you did on the 10th of October, 1827, that you had wilfully shut your eyes upon the truth, than thus to have aggravated your guilt by such a horrid accumulation of falsehoods?

I had transcribed from your columns a small volume of evidence, but enough I am sure has been said, to show on your forehead the odious motto.—"*He that will give most, shall have me.*"

A MARYLAND FARMER.

August 25th 1828.

TO THE PEOPLE.

Fellow Citizens—In the administration address to which we are replying by letters, addressed to its authors, great stress is laid upon the conduct of Gen. Jackson, in undertaking to act against, or without law, at New Orleans especially—this objection was noticed in our eleventh letter, and we should have presented with that letter, the papers, which we now lay before you, if they had been in our possession. We offer them now, and ask for them your particular consideration.

The *first* is a letter from the late President JEFFERSON, written in 1810, the principles of which are most remarkably applicable to the emergencies in which Gen Jackson was called to act five years afterwards—those principles, unless sound in themselves, could not be rendered so even by so high an authority as Mr. Jefferson—upon a dispassionate consideration of them, however, they will be found in accordance with the patriotism of him who acted upon them, as well of him who sanctioned them.

The *second* is the patriotic and appropriate speech, delivered by Mr. C. J. Ingersoll, the representative of this city in Congress, in 1815, when thanks and a gold medal were unanimously voted to Gen. Jackson. The spirit of this address was, at the time, the spirit of the nation; and, we doubt not, is the same spirit, which still animates a large majority of the people, and will ensure the triumph of their cause.

The Athenians, who sacrificed Aristides for the sternness of his virtues, who allowed Miltiades to perish in prison for a sum less than the cost of one of their dramatic exhibitions, and who permitted the greatest philosophers to be murdered under the mask of devotion to the Gods, were already prepared for the yoke of the thirty tyrants. It cannot be the desire or the interest of Americans, to imitate the example of a degenerated people. We cannot conceal from ourselves the fact, that the age, in which we live, is pregnant with political good or evil to mankind; the course of events is only checked in Europe; to this country, the eyes of all liberal men are directed—for the sake of our fame and our prosperity, let us beware of solemnly sanctioning by our votes, the success of a corrupt combination—let us beware of sacrificing a man, whose life has been devoted to the service of his country.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J LEIPER,
CHARLES S COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

August 29.

MR. JEFFERSON'S OPINIONS.

To Mr. J. B Colvin.

Monticello, Sept. 20, 1810.

Sir: Your favor of the 14th, has been duly received, and I have to thank you for the many obliging things respecting myself which are said in it. If I have left in the breasts of my fellow citizens a sentiment of satisfaction with my conduct in the transaction of their business, it will soften the pillow of my repose through the residue of life.

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it a duty in officers of high trust to assume authorities beyond the law, is easy of solution in principle, but sometimes embarrassing in practice. A strict observance of the written laws is doubtless *one* of the high duties of a good citizen: but it is not *the highest* The laws of necessity, of self preservation, of saving our country when in danger, are of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to written law, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus absurdly sacrificing the end to the means. When, in the battle of Germantown, General Washington's army was annoyed from Chew's house, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, although the property of a citizen. When he besieged York Town, he levelled the suburbs, feeling that the laws of property must be postponed to the safety of the nation. While that army was before York, the Governor of Virginia took horses, carriages, provisions, and even men, by force, to enable that army to stay together till it could master the public enemy; and he was justified. A ship at sea, in distress for provisions, meets another having abundance, yet refusing a supply; the law of self-preservation authorizes the distressed to take a supply by force. In all these cases the unwritten laws of necessity, of self-preservation, and of public safety, control the written laws of meum and tuum. Further to exemplify the principle, I will state an hypothetical case. Suppose it had been made known to the Executive of the Union in the autumn of 1808, that we might have the Floridas for a reasonable sum, that that sum had not indeed been

so appropriated by law, but that Congress were to meet within three weeks, and might appropriate it on the first or second day of their session. Ought he, for so great an advantage to his country, to have risked himself by transcending the law, and making the purchase? The public advantage offered, in this supposed case, was indeed immense: but a reverence for law, and the probability that the advantage might still be *legally* accomplished by a delay of only three weeks, were powerful reasons against hazarding the act. But suppose it foreseen that a *********** would find means to protract the proceeding on it by Congress, until the ensuing Spring, by which time new circumstances would change the mind of the other party: Ought the Executive, in that case, and with that foreknowledge, to have secured the good to his country, and to have trusted to their justice for the transgression of the law? I think he ought, and that the act would have been approved. After the affair of the Chesapeake, we thought war a very possible result. Our magazines were ill provided with some necessary articles, nor had any appropriations been made for their purchase. We ventured, however, to provide them, and to place our country in safety, and stating the case to Congress, they sanctioned the act.

To proceed to the conspiracy of Burr, and particularly to Gen. Wilkinson's situation in New Orleans. In judging this case we are bound to consider the state of the information, correct and incorrect, which he then possessed. He expected Burr and his band from above, a British fleet from below, and he knew there was a formidable conspiracy within the city. Under these circumstances, was he justifiable, 1st. In seizing notorious conspirators? On this there can be but two opinions; one, of the guilty and their accomplices; the other, that of all honest men. 2d. Sending them to the seat of government when the written law gave them a right to trial in the territory? The danger of their rescue, of their continuing their machinations, the tardiness and weakness of the law, apathy of the Judges, active patronage of the whole tribe of lawyers, unknown disposition of the juries, an hourly expectation of the enemy, salvation of the city, and of the Union itself, which would have been convulsed to its centre, had that conspiracy succeeded; all these constituted a law of necessity and self-preservation, and rendered the salus populi supreme over the written law. The officer who is called to act on this superior ground, does indeed risk himself on the justice of the controlling powers of the Constitution, and his station makes it his duty to incur that risk. But those controlling powers, and his fellow-citizens generally, are bound to judge according to the circumstances under which he acted. They are not to transfer the information of this place or moment to the time and place of his action: but to put themselves into his situation. We know here that there never was danger of a British fleet from below, and that Burr's band was crushed before it reached the Mississippi. But Gen. Wilkinson's information was very different, and he could act on no other.

From these examples and principles, you may see what I think on the question proposed.—They do not go to the case of persons charged with petty duties, where consequences are trifling, and time allowed for a legal course, nor to authorize them to take such cases out of the written law. In these the example of overleaping the law is of greater evil than a strict adherence to its imperfect provisions. It is incumbent on those only who accept of great charges, to risk themselves on great occasions, when the safety of the nation, or some of its very high interests are at stake. An officer is bound to obey orders: yet he would be a bad one who should do it in cases for which they were not intended, and which involved the most important consequences. The line of discrimination between cases may be difficult; but the good officer is bound to draw it at his own peril, and throw himself on the justice of his country and the rectitude of his motives.

I have indulged freer views on this question on your assurances that they are for your own eye only, and that they will not get into the hands of newswriters. I met their scurrilities without concern, while in pursuit of the great interests with which I was charged: but in my present retirement, no duty forbids my wish for quiet.

Accept the assurances of my esteem and respect. TH: JEFFERSON.

Substance of Mr. Ingersoll's observations on the passage of the resolutions expressive of the thanks of Congress to Gen. Jackson, &c.

Mr. Speaker—I regret that these resolutions require any amendment. I am persuaded, however, that their final passage will be unanimous. The house will excuse me, I hope, if I indulge myself in a few observations on this occasion. I speak impromptu, sir, without premeditation—I have found it impossible to think—I have been able only to feel these last three days. The unexpected, the grateful termination of the glorious struggle we have just concluded, is calculated to excite emotions such as can be understood by those only who can feel them. For the first time during this long, arduous and trying session, we can all feel alike—we are all of one mind—all hearts leap to the embraces of each other. Such a spectacle as that now exhibited by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, was never presented to the world before. While the Senate are ratifying a treaty of peace, the House of Representatives are voting heart-felt thanks to those noble patriots, those gallant citizen soldiers who have crowned that peace with imperishable lustre. The terms of the treaty are yet unknown to us. But the victory at Orleans has rendered them glorious and honorable, be they what they may. They must be honourable under such a termination of the war. Those Commissioners who have afforded us such signal credentials of their firmness heretofore, cannot possibly have swerved. The government has not betrayed its trust. The nation now cannot be discredited. It has done its duty, and is above disgrace. Within five and thirty years of our national existence, we have achieved a second acknowledgment of our national sovereignty. In the war of the revolution we had with allies—in arms—reinforcements from abroad on our own soil—and the wishes of all Europe on our side. But in this late conflict we stood single handed. Not an auxiliary to support us—Not a bosom in Europe that dared beat in our behalf—not one but was constrained to stifle its hopes, if it entertained any in our fa-

sur. The treaty signed at Paris on the 13th of last May placed us in a situation of the utmost emergency. England had triumphed over France —and she turned upon us with her hands full of the implements of destruction—her heart almost bursting with vengeance and fury—malediction in her manifestoes—subjugation on her sword. We have already voted thanks to those heroes of the North who, in Canada, faced and broke the spell of English invincibility. From the north the tempest rolled on to this neighborhood: and it was in the midst of the ruins—the cinders—of this capitol, which became the momentary prize of a successful incursion—it was at a period the most awful, under difficulties the most appalling, that preparations were made to meet the final, the concentrated onset at New-Orleans—the most remote, the weakest point of our territories—the most vulnerable—the hardest to hold—and the hardest to regain if once lost. For the capture of that city a most formidable force was embodied. All the disposable troops to be spared by England from Europe, the detachments scattered along our coasts, all the garrisons and troops that could be collected from the West India Islands, were concentrated for this last and grand object. The gallant and generous inhabitants of the west flew to arms. It was not their fire-sides they had to defend. It was in many cases more than a thousand, in all more than five hundred miles from home they were to seek the scene of their exploits. They went with an immortalizing alacrity of patriotism. Every man of them is entitled to a panegyric. There is no distinction but that of rank to be made between them, and their brave, their wary, their consummate commander. Hardly arrived in New-Orleans when the enemy appeared, they instantly attacked him—and in the night time. The result of this immediate intrepidity was their striking a salutary respect into the invaders. The conquerors of Europe sent the flower of their armies under the most eminent of their commanders, on this expedition. On the 23th December and the 1st of January, attempts were made to carry the American lines—but without success. Without impression. Finding that their men had learned a reluctance to attack from these experiments, the British officers, on the memorable eighth, threw themselves into the front and led on the charge. It is this that alone can account for the enormous effusion of officers' blood. Not relying on the example thus set, they added moreover those enticements, which, at Badajoz and St. Sebastians, had seduced the soldiers to success. They offered beauty and booty—in other words, rape and rapine, as the reward of victory. Thus led and thus invited, the British army made its storm. Their discomfiture is without example—never was there such a disparity of loss. With the tidings of this triumph from the south, to have peace from the east, is such a fulness of gratification as must overflow all hearts with gratitude to the Giver of all good—to that Being who has saved us from the enemy, who has saved us from all harms. Not to be grateful would be impious—not to triumph, cold and churlish indeed. England has conquered Europe. In the midst of her conquests, she is discontented and unhappy. Europe, relieved from French dominion, is already enslaved afresh, cruelly enslaved. Poland, the richest, finest country on that continent, with a population romantically free and patriotic, is annexed to Russia. After fighting the battles of France for the pay of emancipation, Poland falls under the Russian yoke. Saxony, one of the most ancient and respectable of the sovereignties of Europe, is subjoined as a province to Prussia, the most recent, the most despicable of all the European powers—a kingdom which found a transient consequence in the genius of the great Frederick, which never can be considerable without such a genius to sustain it. The Italians are torn from their homes to serve in Austrian armies. Norway dislocated from Denmark to be forced into the arms of Sweden—France is unsettled—Spain convulsed—Holland swelled into an ephemeral magnitude. What a contrast with this happy, thriving, blessed country! Who does not rejoice that he is not an European! Who is not proud to feel himself an American—our wrongs avenged—our rights recognised, for I repeat that no matter what the terms of the treaty may be, the effects of this war must be permanently prosperous and honorable. The catastrophe at Orleans has fixed an impress, has sealed, has consecrated the compact beyond the powers of parchment and diplomacy. At sea a tide of triumphs—by land a continent on which the enemy could gain no foothold. Your navy transcendent in achievements—your army at length equalling your navy. Mr. Speaker, for the richest kingdom in Europe I would not exchange my American citizenship—for the most opulent endowment I would not surrender the delight which I derive from the feelings of this moment. Let us then pass, let us vote by acclamation, the thanks of Congress to Gen. Jackson and his companions in victory.

I cannot resume my seat, sir, without a word of merited eulogium on an individual not comprehended in these resolutions; but to whom the nation is greatly indebted for this success. I mean the present Secretary at War. From the monumental dilapidations of this capital, with enemies to provide against on all quarters, those arrangements were made and those aids afforded by the government, which mainly contributed to the glorious result at Orleans.—Jackson, to be sure, and his cohorts banded together from all regions, by his powerful ascendancy, were the executors—but the able and honest statesman, who now holds the War Department, was the author and originator of the preparations. Let us therefore—I hope all will agree to it—let us consider him, too, in our applause.

LETTER XIV.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Esquires —Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of the 7th July.

Gentlemen: If it is true, as is constantly asserted, that the people of this country are not only free but enlightened, it must be the interest of those, whose cause is good, to rely upon facts and fair argument: so that, when bare assertion, insinuation, and intemperate proscription are resorted to, we may justly doubt the soundness of the cause they are produced to support.

In such a community as ours, what could

have been so decent as a fair exposition of the merits of your own candidate? Yet, it is remarkable, that all you say about him, is embraced in a single line!—whilst columns are filled with invective against his rival!

We have shown that your statements, in relation to the *qualifications* of Gen. Jackson, are peremptorily contradicted, by a series of *civil services*, performed by him, in the course of forty years: and we have shown, that your assertions in relation to his *conduct*, are erroneous, according to the testimony of *all the functionaries* by whom it has been canvassed.

....It is now time to inquire into the *merits* of your own candidate, as you have studiously shunned that subject yourselves: it is time to ask, whether the *political education, principles, conduct* and *measures* of your own candidate, entitle him to the confidence of a free and virtuous people? All inquiries of this kind you carefully supply by a single assertion—that he is an "illustrious patriot!" Now it is remarkable, that, if Mr Adams merits this illustrious title, you did not lay some evidence of his deserts before the public! Such a title is not easy earned—a long train of circumstances must precede the acquirement of the greatest honor, that, in a republic, can be had: but no such foundation is laid by you, and for the simple reason, no doubt, that it could not be done.

"An illustrious patriot!" What do we mean by such an appellation? is it not a man, who, at peril and sacrifice, has laboured to serve his country? if it is—what claim has Mr. Adams to the title? what *peril* has *he* ever encountered, what *sacrifice* has *he* ever made, for his country? is not an illustrious patriot, a man who has been invariably devoted to *the principles of civil liberty*, and to *the promotion of the happiness of his countrymen?* If such is an illustrious patriot, what are the claims of Mr. Adams?

Yes, we call upon you, gentlemen, to point out to the public, what *services* Mr. Adams has ever performed, what *principles* he has ever acted upon, which give him the character of a patriot, or any claim upon the gratitude of his country.

It is, indeed, with amazement, that we regard the position, now held by Mr. Adams, when we dispassionately ask ourselves—*what have been his principles? what has he done?* Nay, it will be with amazement that even *you*, gentlemen, will regard those questions! answer them, you cannot!

When any one says "the patriot Washington" the mind never pauses to consider the truth of the appellation: the generous devotion and the disinterested services of that venerated man are always present to our contemplation: but when you say "the illustrious patriot John Q. Adams," the heart and the head at once resist and detect the imposture: In every page of our history, we find the proof of the patriotism of such men as Washington, Franklin, Hancock—and in the history of his *distinguished services*, we recognise the patriotism of Jackson: but in what page is written, or ever will be written, the *evidence* of the patriotism of Mr. Adams?

No, gentlemen, it is a mistake; your candidate is not, and never will be, regarded as a patriot: his *education* and his *principles* have been *anti-patriotic*, and *self-aggrandizement* has been the regulating passion of his life. Facts will prove it.

....1. The circumstance, that a father entertained anti-republican principles, ought not be mentioned, when we canvass the principles of a son, unless the conduct of the son can be shown to be in accordance with the father's doctrines: but, when that can be shown, it is fair to refer to the doctrines of the father, as the foundation of the principles of the son. What, then, were the sentiments of the father, in relation to *the two great events*, which distinguish the *age* in which we live, the American and French revolutions?* what are the doctrines deliberately advocated in his work on the American constitutions?

It is very true, that Mr. Adams signed the Declaration of Independence; but it is equally true, that he afterwards contradicted what that instrument asserted—the declaration pronounced all men equal, but Mr. Adams, in the work referred to, asserts that men are naturally divided into two classes, the gentlemen who are destined to govern, and the simplemen who are destined to labor! The Declaration of Independence asserts, the long discontent of the colonies, at the oppressions of the British government—its language is "in every stage of 'our oppressions, we have petitioned for re-'dress in the most humble terms—our repeated 'petitions have been answered only by repeat-'ed injury—a prince whose character is thus 'marked by every act which can define a ty-'rant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.'

Mr. Adams, however, in his answer to the address of the young men of Philadelphia, 1798, says....

"For a long course of years, before the birth 'of the eldest of you, I was called to act with 'your fathers, in concerting measures the most 'disagreeable and dangerous; not from a desire 'of innovation—not from discontent at the go-'vernment under which we were bred and born; 'but to preserve the honor of our country, and 'vindicate the immemorial liberty of our ances-'tors In pursuit of those measures, it became, 'not an object of predilection or choice, but of 'indispensible necessity, to assert our indepen-'dence."

What avowal can be more explicit than this? The measures concerted in 1776, were, no doubt, attended with *danger*, but what patriot could consider them *disagreeable*, when they were essential to the liberty of his country? Who, that truly desired to escape from oppression, would say, that necessity, and not choice, dictated measures for relief? Who, that spoke truth, could say, that the revolution, to throw off the yoke of oppression, did not originate in discontent at the oppressors? If it shall be said, that, it is absurd to suppose, Mr. Adams meant to say, that discontent at the conduct of England did not exist; then, there is but one other way in which his words can be interpreted, and that certainly is in accordance with his political principles; he declares, that measures for independence were not concerted from discon-

*The French revolution, says Dr. Priestly, arose from the same general principles as that of America, and in a great measure sprung from it.—*Letter to Edmund Burke*, 1791.

tent of the government, meaning the form of government, king, lords and commons—be his meaning, however, what it may, the avowal is not that of a patriot—it clearly appears, that Mr. Adams lamented the necessity which produced the cutting of the knot.

As soon as independence was established, the political doctrines and views of Mr. Adams were unfolded, in a manner subversive of all doubt. The convention to form a constitution of the United States, met in Philadelphia, in 1787—and on that memorable occasion first appeared, the first volume of Mr. Adams's work, strangely styled a defence of the American Constitutions. The time, the place, and the circumstances of publication, clearly show, that Mr. Adams designed to control public opinion, then in favor of a representative democracy; and to prevail upon the convention to ingraft in the constitution the principles of royalty, nobility and vassalage.

He lays down these principles—that men are divided by nature with two orders; 1. nobility or gentlemen, who are well-born and possess wealth; and 2. simple-men, destined to labor; that between these two orders, a contention must be constantly arising; that, to prevent such a contention, three branches of government* ought to exist, one representing the gentlemen, another the commonalty, and a third, a single person to control the others, with a power to negative all laws proposed by them. Whether those three branches, says he, are called king, lords and commons—or president, senate and house of representatives, is "but the whistling of a name!" To protect the aristocracy, says he, from the madness of the people, give them "a regal power to appeal to"—and to protect the people from the illegal designs of one man, the regal power, let them have "an independent ally in the aristocratical assembly," the lords.

To illustrate his principles, Mr. Adams refers to, and eulogizes the British Government as a model, and laments that Americans are not disposed to give the Executive the power to negative acts of the legislature. 'In future ages,' says he, 'if the present States become great nations, their own feelings and good sense will 'dictate to them what to do—*they may make 'transitions to a nearer resemblance to the British 'constitution*, without the smallest interruption 'to liberty.' 'An *hereditary* Chief Magistrate, 'at once, would perhaps be preferable to elections by legislative representatives.' Again—'The *distinctions* of *poor* and *rich*, are as necessary in States of considerable extent, as labor 'and good government: the *poor* are *destined to 'labor;* and the *rich*, by the advantages of education, independence, and leisure, are qualified for superior stations.' 'The *higher ranks* will never exceed their *inferiors*, but in a certain proportion—but the *distinction* they are absolutely obliged to keep, or fall into contempt and ridicule.'

The framers of the constitution rejected all such regal and aristocratic projects, and experience has sanctioned their course: But the sentiments of Mr. Adams remained unchanged:—Even after he was elected President, he declared, that "he hoped and expected to see the 'day, when Mr. Taylor and Mr. Giles, (distinguished republicans of Virginia) would be convinced that the people of America would "not be happy, without an hereditary chief "magistrate, or at least for life."

Such, gentlemen, were the principles of Mr. J. Adams, during, and subsequent to, the American revolution, the first political convulsion which distinguished this age: Thus you see him instead of seeking to raise mankind to a state of independence, laboring to maintain the doctrines of feudality! You see him contradicting the "truth self-evident" of the declaration of independence! You see him resisting even the purposes of the Creator, and impiously contending that the largest portion of his countrymen were "destined" to labor, in order to keep the few, in riches and leisure, to rule over them!

Lest it should be supposed, that our representation, of the doctrines of Mr. Adams, is in the smallest degree, exaggerated, besides referring to his *book* in all our libraries, we ask public attention to what was said of it in England, immediately after its publication. In the British Monthly Review for 1788, the work of Mr. Adams is particularly noticed—to the following parts of the review, we especially refer:

> "The *great point*, that Mr. Adams wishes to establish, is, that *a democracy*, if such a government could exist, is the very worst form of government; that those devices, which have been often recommended as of such essential consequence for preserving liberty—such as frequency of elections into the general council—a general right of voting among the people; rotation among persons in office, &c. are of very little consequence to mankind; and that freedom can only be preserved, by establishing proper checks on the different branches of administration, or, as he calls it, balances—and by dividing the legislative from the executive power, and rendering the judicial independent of either:—in short by making it in every respect as much as possible the same with the actual constitution of Great Britain."

Again—the review says—

> "Though the judicious reader will perceive, that these observations (of Mr. Adams) are the dictates of sound sense, grounded on experience, yet, if we judge of the sentiments of the people of America by the writings that are popular amongst them, we fear that such remarks will not, at the present moment, be received with all the cordiality which he may wish: the author seems, himself, to think so; and, if we mistake not, he has employed his utmost address *to express them so as not to give disgust*. Probably, many of those passages, which we consider defects, may be ascribed to this cause. 'The regal authority, it is well known, is exceedingly disliked by many of the Americans: and an hereditary nobility is looked on as little less destructive to the community: yet, it is plain from innumerable parts of this work, that Mr. Adams considers those two classes of men, (*king and nobles*) as being, under certain circumstances, not only harmless, but most useful, as bulwarks of freedom. Openly to avow those principles, must have frustrated his view, and to

suppress his notions on that head, would have been mean and disingenuous. He has chosen to steer a middle course."

Again—

"From these extracts the reader will be able to form an idea of the general tendency of this work, and the mode of reasoning adopted by the author. It is not, indeed, as its title says, a defence of the American Constitutions, but it is a warm defence of the Constitution of Great Britain. It is the best anti-democratic treatise that we have seen, for Mr. Adams seems to dread that *that* is the extreme to which his countrymen will naturally lean, and he has exerted his best efforts to obviate that evil."

Such are the opinions of Englishmen, in relation to the work and doctrines of Mr. Adams: what the real doctrines of Mr. Adams were, if disclosed, may be conceived from what he has ventured to avow.

Consider all those doctrines of Mr. Adams, if you please, *matters of opinion*: He had an undoubted right to assert and support them by argument or persuasion: We censure no man for differing from us in sentiment upon any topic: But, when a man, who maintains anti-republican doctrines, seeks to be the magistrate of republicans, it becomes a solemn duty to resist him—and this was the case in 1797. At that time, however, when Mr. John Adams was elected, as his son has subsequent been, somewhat by chance, and much to the surprise of the nation; what was his conduct in the Presidency! Did he abandon his doctrines? far from it—his whole administration was the natural result of his principles or prejudices: an alien law, a sedition law, a standing army, persecution of the republicans, abuse of the French revolution, attachment to England, hostility to France—such were the characteristics of "the reign of terror"!

Can you be astonished, when you reflect upon such *facts*, that the American people, in 1800, dismissed Mr. Adams? Is it not marvellous, that he ever reached the presidency?—And, what is our condition now? Have the *principles* and the *conduct* of the *son* differed from those of the *father*? We shall show you, that, of the two, the father was the most sincere, and of course the less dangerous. We shall show you, that, what the father would have held by open activity, the son has gained, and seeks to hold, by hypocrisy and corruption. We do not *assert* this merely, we will give good reasons for our convictions, without the slightest unkind feeling towards Mr. Adams personally, but under a serious sense of our duty to the public.

Respectfully, your, &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,	WM. J. DUANE,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,	WM. J. LEIPER,
WILLIAM BOYD,	CHAS. S. COXE,
HENRY TOLAND,	THOS. M. PETTIT,
JOHN WURTS,	

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

August 25th, 1828.

* The doctrine of three branches, one regal, is as old as Tacitus—but even Tacitus admits that such a system could not long exist.

A CAUTION.

The friends of General Jackson are cautioned against a trick which, it is understood, is to be the dernier resort of the Ebonites, when they find all their other machinations to fail. It is understood that about the time of the election, or so near it, that the report cannot be contradicted, one simultaneous movement will be made throughout the United States. It will be reported that GENERAL JACKSON IS DEAD. It is useless to point out the effect which this would have on the election if believed. It would go to establish that, which, of every thing would be the most disagreeable to the friends of Reform: it would promote John Quincy Adams to the Presidential Chair. But we caution all our readers against the hellish project, and not to suffer themselves to be imposed upon by it. It is our intention to keep this article at the head of a column in our paper till after the day of election; and we call upon all those Jackson editors with whom we exchange to warn their readers in the same manner.—*Ed. Cincinnati Advertiser.*

TENNESSEE.—We have been furnished with a letter, of which the following is an extract, from the son of a respectable German, formerly of Lebanon county in this State, but for many years a citizen of Tennessee, to his brother in Lebanon.—*American Sentinel.*

"*Sumner County, Tenn. June 10th, 1828.*

"I should like to know whether there is any stir in your neighborhood. I feel considerably interested, as one of the candidates (Gen. Jackson) is my neighbour. I have been raised within fourteen miles of him. Father has often sat as a juror, and heard him plead law; but he has long since quit it, and went to farming, his favorite occupation. He is a plain, steady old farmer, and never leaves his farm only when his country needs his services. The men that served under him in the army love him as a father. You have, no doubt, heard the story of the six militia men that were shot. There were many of my neighbours in the army at the time—they all believed then, and yet believe he did right in that case. During the war, seven-eighths of the men of Sumner county served under him, either as volunteers or drafted men, and he will not lose twenty men in the county, and such as are opposed to him are those that were opposed to the war and Mr. Madison's administration. I hope you will vote for the Jackson ticket.

Binns and several other coalitionists have set down Tioga county, (Penn.) for the administration. It goes to show what grounds they rest on. There certainly is not a county in the State more unanimous on any question than Tioga is for Jackson.

Binns in his last paper calculates on 28 electoral votes in Pennsylvania for Adams, and in North Carolina, 15!!—*Northern Ban.*

Important Receipe.—A man, after drinking imprudently of cold water, in one of our cities, was soon relieved from great distress by dissolving half an ounce of camphor in a gill of brandy, which was divided into three parts and given at intervals of three minutes.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*; subject to newspaper postage, and *no more*.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, SEPTEMBER 20, 1828. No. 28.

LETTER XV.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Esqrs. Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of the 7th July.

GENTLEMEN: In the absence of all explanation on your part, we are inquiring into the *political principles, services*, and *measures* of your candidate. We referred, in our last letter, to the political principles and actions, of the father, as the models of the son; and we shall now inquire, whether that example was not faithfully followed.

We know no way, in which the political principles of a candidate can be so well tested, as by ascertaining his sentiments in relation to the American and French revolutions. Upon the questions involved in those great events, there could have been no *neutrals;* every man must have been either a friend to reform, or in favor of a perpetuity of existing establishments. As to the American revolution, the doctrines of Mr. John Adams alone can be referred to; and, we have shown that those doctrines were hostile to the declaration of independence. It was at the dawn of the French revolution, that Mr. John J. Adams arrived at manhood; and, we shall show, that he adhered to the doctrines of his father.

....Even amongst the enlightened people of the United States of the present day, an astonishing prejudice prevails, respecting the causes and character of the French revolution. The pensioned writers of Europe, and their servile copyists in America, have so grossly misrepresented its origin, progress, and end, that it is often spoken of as a sort of irruption of barbarians, rather than as the effort of a gallant people to assert their independence; we seem to forget, that our own revolution was the spark which kindled the flame of freedom in Europe; that, if we had failed in our object, we should have been treated as rebels—and that the failure of the French is attributable, not to the unsoundness of their cause, but to the combined influence of the money, pens, and bayonet of Europe.

The cause of the French was, in fact, the cause of mankind, the struggle of the oppressed against the oppressors—it involved the same questions which had been but lately before settled in America—the same questions which have since agitated Spain, which now convince Portugal, and which must continue to be discussed, so long as any part of mankind shall prefer the safety and honor of freedom, to the danger and dishonor of vassalage.

If we, of the present day, desire to know what were the feelings of America, at the dawn of the French revolution, we have only to consider our own sentiments, when the Riegos and Quirogas, of Spain, shook off the yokes of Ferdinand and the inquisition—and if we desire to know what was thought of the French revolution, six years after its commencement, let us consult the testimony left to us by Washington. When France, in January, 1796, presented her standard to the United States, Washington made this eloquent reply to the minister of that country:

...."Born, Sir, in a land of liberty; having early learned its value: having engaged in a perilous conflict to defend it; having, in a word, devoted the best years of my life to secure its permanent establishment in my own country; my anxious recollections, my sympathetic feelings, and my best wishes are irresistibly excited, whenever, in any country, I see an oppressed nation unfurl the banner of freedom: but, above all, the events of the French revolution have produced the deepest solicitude, as well as the highest admiration. To call your nation brave, were to pronounce but common praise: Wonderful people! Ages to come will read, with astonishment, the history of your brilliant exploits!

"I rejoice that the period of your toils, and of your immense sacrifices is approaching: I rejoice, that the interesting revolutionary movements of so many years have issued in the formation of a constitution, designed to give permanency to the great object, for which you have contended. I rejoice that liberty, which you have so long embraced with enthusiasm, and of which you have been the invincible defenders, now finds an asylum in the bosom of a regular, organized government—a government, which, being formed to secure the happiness of the French people, corresponds with the ardent wishes of my heart, whilst it gratifies the pride of every citizen of the United States, by its resemblance to our own: on these glorious events, accept, Sir, my sincere congratulations.

"In delivering to you these statements, I express not my own feelings only, but those of my fellow citizens, in relation to the *commencement*, the *progress*, and the *issue* of the French revolution; and they will cordially join with me in purest wishes to the Supreme Being, that the citizens of our sister republic, our magnanimous allies, may soon enjoy in peace, that liberty, which they have purchased at so great a price, and all the happiness that liberty can bestow.

"I receive, Sir, with lively sensibility, the symbol of the triumphs, and of the enfranchisement of your nation—the colors of France, which you have now presented to the United States. The transaction will be announced to Congress; and the colors will be deposited with those archives of the United States, which are at once the evidences and the memorials of their freedom and independence. May these be perpetual, and may the friendship of the two republics be commensurate with their existence."

....Such were the sentiments of Washington—such were the feelings of the American people. What were the sentiments and the feelings of Messrs. Adams, father and son? Did they concur with Washington and their country, in favor of France and freedom—or enrol themselves in the ranks of the enemies of both? Let us, although out of the order of time, ascertain the sentiments of the father in the first place, and then consider the conduct of the son.

In little more than one year, after Washington delivered the foregoing address, Mr. John

Adams became President, and, before the end of two years, he involved the "sister republics" in hostilities! To sustain his popularity, a series of addresses were got up from various parts of the United States, and in his replies to them, Mr. Adams indulged in the most offensive invectives against our "magnanimous allies." If he had confined himself to censures upon the public agents of France, the friends of freedom would not have had so much occasion to complain; but he assailed not only the French revolution, but all who approved of it—in his reply, in 1798, to an address of certain citizens of Vermont, he said—

"I have seen in the conduct of the French nation, for the last twelve years, a repetition of their character, displayed under Louis XIV. and little more—except the extravagances, which have been intermingled with it, of the wildest philosophy, which was ever professed in this world since the building of Babel."

Thus Mr. John Adams wrote, in less than two years after Washington had exulted at the origin, progress, and end of the revolution in France: Washington saw, in that revolution, an oppressed people unfurling the banner of freedom—Mr. Adams saw in it an extravagant philosophy, like the building of Babel: Washington saw in the resistance of France against the armies of the allies, the brilliant exploits of a brave people fighting for liberty—Mr. Adams considered the triumphs of the French as no more than the ambitious projects of a despotic King!

Can any one doubt the political principles of Washington, who reads his address! Can any one doubt the nature of Mr. Adams' principles, who contrasts his replies with the address of Washington? Let us now inquire into the conduct of Mr. J. Q. Adams.

....The natural consequence of the reform of abuses in France, was to call the attention of the people of England, in particular, to the corruptions that had crept into their own country, and to produce a diffusion of intelligence and spirit amongst them. The celebrated Dr. Price, the steady friend of America, and the enlightened correspondent of Franklin, was amongst the first to proclaim to his countrymen, the importance of reform in Britain: On the 4th November, 1789, he delivered his "discourse, on the love of country," in which he maintained the doctrines, asserted in the declaration of American Independence—that the end of government is the happiness of the people—that all civil governors are but the servants of the people—that the people have a right to cashier their agents, and choose others—and that they have a right to frame a government for themselves.

In 1790, Mr. Edmund Burke published his "Reflections on the French Revolution"—a work in which, almost every principle, avowed in the American Declaration of Independence and constitutions, is scoffed at and denied: It is immaterial to our purpose to refer to the opprobrious manner in which Mr. Burke spoke of the French people: what we have to do is to show the unsoundness of his doctrines, and to do so, it is barely sufficient to enumerate them: He contended, that the people of England had no right to alter the form of their government—that the Kings of England did not derive their right to the crown from the choice of the people, and were not responsible to them—that at the revolution of 1688, the people had abdicated for themselves and posterity all right to elect their Kings—that the principle of hereditary succession was sacred—that "the very idea of "the fabrication of a new government was "enough to fill one with disgust and horror"—that an established church was an essential part of government.

To this work of Mr. Burke, replies were published by Dr. Priestley, Mr. Thomas Paine, Mr. Capel Lofft, and others, in 1790 and 1791:

'It is with very sensible regret,' says Dr. Priestly, 'that I find Mr. Burke and myself on 'the opposite sides of any important question; 'and especially that I must now no longer class 'him among *the friends of what I deem to be the 'cause of liberty, civil and religious*, after having, in a pleasing occasional intercourse of 'many years, considered him in this respectable 'light. That an avowed friend of the American 'revolution, should be an enemy to that of the 'French, which arose from the same general 'principles, and in a great measure sprung from 'it, is to me unaccountable."

Mr. Thomas Paine, in his "Rights of Man," re-asserted the principles avowed by Dr. Price, and which had been controverted by Mr. Burke. in a comparison between the French and the English systems, he gave a preference to the French constitution, because it guaranteed civil and religious liberty to all men, and the freedom of speech and of the press: it took from the crown the power to make war, without the consent of the legislature: it abolished game laws, monopolies, and seigniories: it declare the people to be the source of all authority: it secured the trial by jury: it prohibited ministers of the crown, placemen and pensioners from holding seats in the legislature: it abolished imprisonment, except by due course of law: it established the principle, no taxation without representation.

....Such, gentlemen, is a very brief exposition of the controversy produced in England, by the French revolution. The whigs of England, headed by Earl Stanhope, Mr. Fox and others, cordially congratulated the French upon their political reformation, and advocate a correction of abuses at home. The tories, headed by Mr. Jenkinson, afterwards Lord Liverpool, Mr. Dundas, and others, to arrest reform, plunged the nation into war against France. In short, there were then, as there are now, but two parties, the *Liberals* and the *Absolutes*.

....What part did J. Q. Adams take at that crisis? On this question he has shown sensibility—he feels it is a tender point—he appeared in the public newspapers, upon this topic, in 1822—he admitted that he did take a part, as writer of eleven letters signed Publicola, but denied any design to oppose the rights of man: if he had pleaded youth or inexperience, no one could with propriety push the matter further; but he made no excuse, and asserts now what he asserted in 1791.

To answer the question, what part he took, it is simply enough to assert, what no one can contradict, that there were Burke, Pitt, and Jenkinson on one side; and Price, Priestly and Paine on the other: if the principles advocated by the latter, had been supported by Mr

Adams, he would have said so, and every body would have given him applause; but he could not say so, for he had actually taken part with the former. Dr. Priestly ceased to regard Mr. Burke as a friend to liberty, as soon as Mr. Burke's book appeared; Mr. Adams did not enter the list against Burke, but against his antagonist, Paine—and from that moment was obnoxious to Dr. Priestley's objection.

No one can with truth controvert what we here say—the evidence is in all our own respectable libraries: but it is only by consulting the evidence throughout that the truth will fully appear: for it is certainly a fact, that the arguments and statements of Mr. Adams are so disguised, that all the parts must be scrutinized and contrasted with sound principles, fully to comprehend the drift of the whole. The main question, as we have stated, was, whether the people of England had a right to reform their government—on this, Mr. Adams throws his whole weight into the scale of Mr. Burke, and almost in his words supports his anti-revolution doctrine: in his third letter, he asserts, that, in 1688, the people had renounced, for themselves and posterity, all right to decide, in their original character, who should be their agents—that they had surrendered to the king, lords and commons, not only all such right, but the power to alter the constitution itself. If it shall be said, that this was mere matter of opinion, we answer, that it was an opinion against the whigs, and in favor of the tories, of England—that it was an opinion against the principles of civil liberty: If Dr. Priestley was right, in refusing to consider Mr. Burke a friend to liberty, after he had advocated such doctrines, surely we are justified in coming to the same conclusion as to Mr. Adams.

The whigs of England, and Mr. Paine their advocate, alleged that the constitution of France was better than the system of England—

Because—it secured religious toleration: Mr. Adams does not advert to this superiority.

Because—it placed the power of war and peace in the legislature and not in the crown: Mr. Adams defends the English system, giving the power to make war or peace to the king—

Because—it prohibited ministers, placemen and pensioners from sitting in the legislature: Mr. Adams advocates the English system, under which ministers and pensioners rule the parliament.

Because—it prohibited the legislature from creating monopolies, or passing game-laws: Mr. Adams defends the English system, and insists that it is right to reserve the power to make game-laws.

In the 7th letter of Publicola, Mr. Adams advocates the absolute transfer by the people of all their power, to the King, lords and commons; and in support of this gross doctrine, advances the most powerful argument, that could be urged against it: upon an alarm, says he, the parliament changed their duration from three to seven years—if they had not the entire power in their hands, and had not done this, mischief might have followed! So that, he advocates a power, which would enable a corrupt parliament, upon their own assertion of danger, to deprive the people of their right to elect representatives, just as long as the parliament may choose,—seventy years as well as seven!

What further proof is needful, to show the real principles of Mr. Adams? Is it wonderful that his essays, as he admits, drew down upon him torrents of censure? why did his countrymen in 1791 so bitterly complain of the letters of Publicola, if they were not hostile to civil liberty? in those letters, he declared that the British constitution had long been the admiration of the world! that he hoped such an excellent system would not be abolished, merely because it was not, like a deed, in a written form! Speaking of the American revolution, he said it was the result of "an unaccountable necessity!" and speaking of the French revolution, he said, that people in America could not decide, whether the condition of the French was such as to warrant it!

Surely comment is not necessary! Can any one doubt what were the principles of Mr. Adams in 1791—re-asserted in 1822?—All the world knows the causes of the American Revolution—but Mr. Adams ascribes it to an unaccountable necessity! All the world knows, as Washington said, that the French were an oppressed people, groaning under an intolerable despotism—but Mr. Adams said it was doubtful whether their revolution was justifiable!

....In an inquiry, like the present, conciseness is not to be expected: we aim to prove the anti-republican doctrines and tendencies of Mr. J. Q. Adams—that he is not "an illustrious patriot"—and that he ought not to receive the suffrages of a free people.

Respectfully, yours, &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

August 28th, 1828.

LETTER XVI.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Esqrs.—Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of the 7th July.

GENTLEMEN:—Our inquiry into the political principles of Mr. Adams, extended, in our last letter, to the year 1791: As he was, soon after, invested with a public employment, our attention will now be directed to his *services* as well as *principles*.

In 1794, Mr. Adams was appointed minister to Holland, and subsequently to Prussia, from whence he returned in 1801. The ten years, succeeding 1791, embraced one of the most important periods in the annals of the world: A fairer occasion had never been before presented for the exercise of patriotism and talent, as a negotiator or a writer; yet we know of no act or incident, which shows that Mr. Adams had the smallest sympathy with the friends of freedom.

The only product of his pen, in the course of ten years, consisted of letters written in Prussia, and addressed to his brother in the United States, descriptive of a journey into Silesia:--Those letters are remarkably sterile of comment or allusion, in relation to the great drama, then performing on the political theatre of Europe; in the most prominent instance, in which reference is made to the belligerents, Mr. Adams leans against republican France. Describing Silesia, he represents many of the people of the country as serfs, laborers sold with the land, and transferred from master to master---compelled to perform the labor of ten days in six---and habitually asking from travellers even the smallest pittance; and yet, at the close of his letters he pronounces a pompous encomium upon the despot, who had held the Silesians in this deplorable condition! The Edinburgh Review, vol. 5, page 182, very justly says, in reference to the letters on Silesia, "Mr. Adams has many recollections of his native country, but his feelings "about it, more resemble the loyal acquiescence "of a subject, than the personal interest and ar"dor of a republican."

You have, gentlemen, called Mr. Adams "an illustrious patriot," and he is often styled "an able statesman:" it is not difficult to apply such titles, but the appellation does not establish the fact. If, indeed, success in obtaining appointments, principally from his father, when President, constitutes a title to statesmanship; Mr. Adams is a statesman—he had appointments to Portugal, Holland, Sweden, and Prussia: But men of sense look beyond the mere tenure of office, for *results: We ask you*, then, what advantages did his country derive from the diplomacy of Mr. Adams, up to 1801? Whilst receiving his salary, as resident minister at Berlin, he drew outfits and salaries for other stations; an appointment to Stockholm, for instance, conferred in March, 1798, by his father: for all the emoluments, thus accumulated, what actual service did he render? What had he done, to merit this monopoly of diplomatic fortune? What advantage, in reputation or trade, did the country derive from his statesmanship? In vain do we look for proofs of benefit—a treaty was renewed, but not discussed: no new principles were established; on the contrary, some, that were essential to the reputation and the rights of neutral America, were abandoned! In 1785, Dr. Franklin had negotiated a treaty with Prussia, in which these principles were recognised —1. That if either should be at war with a third power, the trade of the neutral should not be interrupted with the belligerent: 2. That the neutral flag should protect the goods of the belligerent on board the neutral vessel: 3. That the neutral flag should protect all persons, except soldiers in service: This treaty, by limitation, was to expire in 1795; and, when then renewed by Mr. Adams, he gave up all those salutary principles, and, as is stated in the treaty, for the very reason that ought to have prevented their abandonment—namely, that the belligerents had not respected them. (See laws U. S. vol. 1. p. 234.)

We have no evidence, therefore, that up to the year 1801, Mr. Adams rendered such services as give him a claim to the distinctions of patriot and statesman, or to his country's gratitude.

On the election of Mr. Jefferson to the Presidency, in that year, the embassy to Berlin was included in the number of *abuses corrected*, and Mr. Adams returned to the United States—with all the resentments, produced by the removal of his father from power, and the stoppage of his own diplomatic career. Instead of observing the moderation which a sense of personal delicacy demanded from an individual just recalled, and the son of a President just rejected; Mr. Adams, on his return to Boston, became the prominent leader of the New England faction, which, according to the authority of Mr. Mathew Carey, had been laboring, since 1796, to produce a dissolution of the Union! Soon after his return, he was placed in the Senate of Massachusetts: and, in 1803, a vacancy having taken place in the representation of that State, in the Senate of the Union, he was proposed as a candidate, in competition with Mr. Timothy Pickering, of his own party, and with Gen. Skinner, the candidate of the republican party.

As Mr. Adams has claimed to be of the republican party, and as in Pennsylvania especially, his friends desire to take advantage of this imposture, it is necessary to expose it. The Boston Centinel, (the same paper in which Mr. Adams published his Publicola, in 1791, which, in 1814, was the organ of the Hartford Convention, and which upholds Mr. Adams now,) published this statement on the 5th February, 1803: "The federalists of Massachusetts se'lected two persons, both of whom have been 'the objects of democratic persecution, the 'Hon. Timothy Pickering, late Secretary of 'State, and the Hon. J. Q. Adams, late Minis'ter to Berlin"—to fill the vacancy in the Senate United States: "When circumstances 'place two such men as candidates for the same 'office, it is not an easy task to give a prefer'ence."

The task was, indeed, difficult—four trials by ballot, were made before a choice was effected; the republican members of the Massachusetts legislature, in each instance voting for Gen. Skinner, and the federal members dividing, some for Mr. Adams and some for Mr. Pickering, until the fourth ballot, when Mr. Adams was chosen. This result speaks a language that cannot be misunderstood—ardent an opponent of the republican party as Mr. Pickering had been, Mr. Adams was by federalists preferred to him---a fact, which shows the extent of his zeal for them, of their zeal in his behalf, of his subsequent treachery, or of the subsequent meanness of many of them.

....Here, then, gentlemen, we find Mr. Adams for the first time in Congress—in the Senate too, as the representative of federal Massachusetts—a field sufficiently ample for the display of all the qualities of the most illustrious patriot or able statesman. Was his conduct there that of a patriot, or factious leader? Can you refer to any bill, motion, resolution, or vote, which denoted patriotism? Why do you, the friends of Mr. Adams, oblige us, his opponents, to search, volume after volume, to test the accuracy of your encomiums upon him? Surely, in the Senate, U. States, Mr. Adams could not have been an idle member.—What, then, were his actions, denoting the patriot and statesman? Is it not evident, that, if any measure had been

opposed, or any vote had been given by him, calculated to confer honor upon him, you would have been glad to make it known? Can your utter silence upon such vital questions, be attributed to any thing else than your inability to sustain the character of patriot, which you assign to him?

But, gentlemen, if *you* will not execute the duty, *we* must inquire; and therefore we proceed to examine some of the actions of Mr. Adams, in 1803—4—5 and 6.

1. Whatever, gentlemen, may have been your prejudices in relation to Mr. Jefferson, you are now, we presume, disposed to do justice to his merits: you will confess, we think, that he evinced "illustrious patriotism" and statesmanship, in the acquisition of Louisiana; to use the language of the writer of able letters, published in the Albany Argus, in reply to an address of Gen. P. B. Porter of New-York, and to which we are under obligations—"the importance of "the acquisition is now unquestioned: to the "Western States, its value is so great, that it "cannot be brought within the limits of an esti- "mate. Without it their access to the ocean "would have been obstructed, they would have "been destitute of a market; and the continued "occlusion of New-Orleans, by depriving them "of the stimulus of industry, would have produc- "ed a most pernicious effect on the moral char- "acter of the people; they would either have "been compelled to surmount the mountainous "barrier, which separated them from the Atlan- "tic, and return to their original homes, or to "take the city by force, and by waging war se- "parately, to have produced a virtual dissolution "of the confederacy.—Deprived of a commer- "cial intercourse with the Atlantic States, the "Union would have offered but few advantages "to them, and the most trifling accident would "have broken the connexion between them and "the States of the Atlantic. The acquisition of "Louisiana identified the interests of the East "and the West: A commercial connexion mutu- "ally advantageous, destroyed the germs of jeal- "ousy, and feelings of a kindly character were "soon cultivated between the people inhabiting "either extremity of our common empire: It re- "moved all fears of a foreign invasion from the "West, gave us an influence over the savages, "commanding and absolute, bounded us on the "Gulf of Mexico, and opened the trade of the "world to the remotest inhabitants of the inte- "rior: It gave us both banks of the most magni- "ficent river on the earth, from its sources to "the ocean: It gave us a territory boundless in "extent, and with it, capacities of increasing "greatness beyond the most sanguine anticipa- "tions of the boldest imagination.

....Is there the least excess of colouring in this picture? If it is a fair representation, as you must admit it is, what can you offer as an apology for the opposition of Mr. Adams, in a minority of three, (Adams, Plumer and Wells,) to the acquisition of those immense advantages? you cannot urge his own apology at the time, for he has himself since abandoned it. Where, then, was his patriotism and his statesmanship in 1804?

2. On the same occasion, when the details of the bills in relation to Louisiana, were considered, Mr. Adams voted, that no person should be eligible as a representative, who did not hold in his own right one hundred acres of land in fee simple, or a house and lot in New-Orleans; and that no person should vote for a representative, who did not hold a freehold of fifty acres of land! Was this a token of his republicanism?

3. When the imperfection of the Constitution, and the intrigues of Mr. Burr in 1801, had spread alarm throughout the Union, every patriot, and indeed, every considerate person, desired to see the constitution so amended, that the electors might designate the candidate they preferred for the Presidency, and the candidate they preferred for the Vice-Presidency—on this great question, Mr. Adams voted against the popular will: upon what pretext, gentlemen, can you justify this act? was it patriotic, or the effect of prejudice against Mr. Jefferson? As we shall hereafter show you, the New-England members, in 1801, preferred a convulsion to the election of Mr. Jefferson!

....In short, in the session of 1803-4, Mr Adams voted invariably against the measures recommended by the Jefferson administration, without proposing any measures himself, indicative of high capacity or exalted views. In the succeeding session, he continued his hostility.

4. A bill was introduced, to prevent the waging private war, without national authority, against the people and commerce of other States: upon what pretext could a measure, to prevent such outrages be opposed? what could be more humane, just, or politic, than an effort thus to prevent aggression by our own citizens, and to avert the resentment of other States? yet Mr. Adams voted against it!

5. A bill, of a similar pacific tendency, was proposed, at the instance of Mr. Jefferson, to prevent the violation of the laws, and outrages upon the rights of strangers, by vessels of the United States, within our own jurisdiction: against this also Mr. Adams voted, in a minority of three!

6. At the same session, 1804-5, Mr. Jefferson called the attention of Congress to the conduct of belligerent vessels hovering on our coasts and harbors, seeking, contrary to the laws of nations, to assail enemies there: Mr. Adams voted in a minority of three (Adams, Pickering, Plumer,) against even the reference of the subject to the consideration of a committee!

...The first instance in which Mr. Adams voted with the republicans, in the Senate, was on the 15th April, 1806, on a resolution to suspend the non-importation act, until November in the same year:—a vote, attributed, as we think justly, to the change in the politics of Massachusetts, and to the desire to conciliate the ascending republicans: Nevertheless, in the session of 1806-7, he voted in the Senate, very generally with his old friends; and, finding the political current running strongly in their favor on his return to Boston, in March, 1807, he presided at the federal caucus, which nominated Mr. Caleb Strong for Governor—the same Caleb Strong, who assembled the legislature of Massachusetts, in 1814, when the British burnt Washington, for the purpose of guiding the Union at that crisis, but to elect delegates to the Hartford Convention!

....We have thus shown, gentlemen—1, that from 1794 to 1801, Mr. Adams held various

diplomatic appointments: yielding great emolument, several at one and the same time, no public advantages from which have ever been shown to have been derived; and that, in one instance, Mr. Adams abandoned principles, important to America:—2. that from 1801 to 1807, he was the leader of the New England faction, which, according to Mr. M. Carey, had been conspiring, ever since 1796, to dissolve the Union:—3. that, as a Senator, he had opposed all the measures, right or wrong, of Mr. Jefferson's administration, without proposing a single measure, indicative of patriotism or statesmanship—if we err in this inference—if Mr Adams did perform any action indicative of patriotism or statesmanship, we ask you to point it out.

....In 1807, a crisis had arrived: a republican administration was chosen in Massachusetts: When, and not until then, did Mr. Adams evince indecision! then, and not until then, did he determine to go with the current: *What produced his change?*

We ask you, gentlemen, what produced the decision of Mr. Adams, in 1807, to abandon the federal party, and attach himself to the republican? That he belonged to the federal party—that he had uniformly written, spoken, and voted against republican principles, measures, and men, from 1791 to 1807, no man of truth will deny—that he had headed the federal party after his return to Boston, in March, 1807, no one has ever ventured to contradict: *why*, then, did Mr. Mr. Adams suddenly abandon his old friends, and go over to those whom he had uniformly reviled? We shall consider these questions in our next letter.

Respectfully, yours, &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

August 30th, 1828.

CIRCULAR.

To the Jackson Committees of Correspondence of Pennsylvania.

FELLOW CITIZENS—Although we were appointed a Committee of Correspondence, for a single district only, as that district embraced the city of Philadelphia, the point at which information is most quickly received, and from whence it is most extensively circulated; we did not hesitate to address the Committees of Correspondence of other States, giving to them our opinions in relation to the political prospects of Pennsylvania, and soliciting from them information respecting their own.

We have thus received, within the past month, a mass of cheering information, upon the fidelity of which we can rely; and, as the sentiments, contained in several letters to us, must be gratifying to you, we annex extracts.

From all the sources of intelligence, within our reach, we present the following table—

	Jackson.	*Adams.*	*Doubtful.*
Alabama	5		
Carolina N.	15		
Carolina S.	11		
Connecticut		8	
Delaware			3
Georgia	9		
Illinois	3		
Indiana			5
Kentucky	14		
Louisiana			5
Maine		8	1
Maryland	5	4	2
Massachusetts		13	
Mississippi	3		
Missouri	3		
New Hampshire		8	
New Jersey			8
New York	24	13	
Ohio			16
Pennsylvania	28		
Rhode Island		4	
Tennessee	11		
Vermont		7	
Virginia	24		
	155	66	40

The view, which we thus present, is not designed for effect—we have no wish to intimidate our opponents, or to create a pernicious confidence amongst our friends: we simply present this table as the result of our information.

Undoubtedly, we are encouraged, to anticipate a great and honorable triumph, at the electoral election on the 31st of October next; and we have no cause to suppose, that Pennsylvania will change the proud position which she held four years ago: but we protest against the prevailing sentiment, deceptiously circulated in this state, that exertion is needless: we believe it to be needless, as to the result; but we aver that exertion is demanded by every consideration, connected with the purity of our institutions, and the honor of Pennsylvania.

When we anticipated danger, four years ago, we deemed exertion a sacred duty; the danger, then *threatened* only, is now *felt*—and is this a time to relax? The safety and purity of our institutions depend upon zeal at all elections: but the election that is at hand, will be the most important ever held in this or any other country: the present contest is, in fact, vital!

In 1776, a foreign tyranny exercised its power openly and without disguise, and it was therefore more exposed to resistance and defeat: In 1798 a domestic tyranny was equally undisguised in its objects and actions; and was, therefore, with comparative facility, met and overcome: but our present opponents, taking counsel from experience, now rely upon *corruption* and not force—upon *fraud* rather than intimidation. Our candidate and his active friends are, indeed, proscribed, as the whigs were in 1776, and as the republicans were in 1798—but the main and pervading power, now employed against us, is MONEY—that instrument, which, in Europe has overcome all opposers, and which in America, Mr. Clay has told us, can accomplish any purpose whatever!

Yes, fellow citizens, the effort is now made,

for the first time in this republic, to effect a mighty revolution, by the employment of the public money, and the contributions of those who maintain themselves by public abuses! Is it enough, that such a scheme should be merely defeated? Do we desire to terminate evil now, or push off danger to our posterity? Would it not be odious, to hand to them an inheritance, with an incumbrance that must produce its loss? If there are any, who doubt the foul means by which the present administration acquired power—let them be indifferent, if they please; but, who can with honor or safety be passive, who reflects upon the scenes before us?

Has not the will of the people been as corruptly set aside, as if purses of gold had been the medium of exchange? What constitutes corruption—the quality of the bribe, or the fact of its acceptance? Shall we scorn the debasing practices of European politicians, and lament the condition of abused nations in the old world, and yet tolerate the very practices here that must degrade us to the same condition?

Will it be no triumph to our opponents—no stimulus to their future exertions—if, relying upon the goodness of our cause, and our known strength, we gain but a meagre majority? Shall we in 1828 be content with twenty thousand, when we can give forty thousand?* Look at our opponents! is there any effort, fair or foul, which they are not employing; and is this a time for us to be contenting ourselves with certain but mere success? Is it enough to be strong?—should we not show our strength at such a crisis as the present? By political effort, are we not promoting our own welfare, and the happiness of our posterity, even more than by the accumulation of dollars or acres? The liberty, that we possess, cost much blood and treasure—are a few days devotion to the business of election, in each year, too much to pay for its preservation?

We are told that our condition is prosperous—whom have we to thank, if it is so? Have we not to be grateful, next to Providence, to those who have gone before us, and left us a precious patrimony? How long will that patrimony remain with us, if we remain unmindful of our duties? It is said that our trade is prosperous, but truth contradicts the assertion—the market of the West Indies has been shut against our breadstuffs by the neglect and improvidence of the administration. It is said, that our public debt is reduced; but who has the merit of this? not those now in power, but the administration of Jefferson, which laid the foundation of frugality: as well might a collector of tolls on a turnpike take to himself the merit of a good road, as the administration claim thanks for the mere receipt and payment of moneys, provided by a republican policy: There can be no deception as to the general funds of the nation, but what is the condition of the moneys left at the particular control of the administration? It is applied, not for public uses, but to pay and reward political partisans.

In the days of Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, nobody saw them, or their officers, travelling through the country, partaking of political dinners, or making political harangues, to secure their election: When we see their successors departing from their example, is it not time to arouse? To avoid all intercourse with the prominent men of the Union, General Jackson resigned his seat in the Senate of the United States, and retired to his farm. He never sought the Presidency; he does not now seek it, for his own sake: he was appointed by the President and the Senate, in 1823, Minister to Mexico,† with the right to put eighteen thousand dollars at once in his pocket—but he refused the station, because he would not be Minister to an usurper: no act of his life shows a desire for service, for any other end but utility to his country—every act of his rival shows his object to have been always mercenary: What, then, can give to General Jackson higher claims to our gratitude and regard?

In whatever light we consider the present contest, therefore, in relation to principles or men, we are impressed with a conviction, that it is the serious duty of every freeman to be at his post: we should not be waiting for others, or excusing ourselves by their bad example, but act as if the result depended upon our own votes—and thus, and thus only, will Pennsylvania preserve the distinguished position, which she holds, of being the first to nominate, and the most unanimous in support of the Farmer of Tennessee.

We offer these observations to you, fellow-citizens, with a frankness, that becomes freemen: We see in the conduct of many of our friends, not merely the confidence, which is the result of conscious strength—but an inactivity, which, when contrasted with the ardor of our opponents, is holy unsuited to the crisis. We respectfully suggest, therefore, that the several committees of correspondence, appointed by the republican convention of the 8th of January last, should take prompt measures to convince their fellow citizens, that the republic expects every man to do his duty.

We ought to direct our attention with equal zeal to the general election, on the 14th, and the presidential election, on the 31st of October next: the result of the first may have an influence upon the second, in other States, and we should leave no fair and honorable effort unemployed to secure a great triumph on each occasion—we have only to will a great triumph to secure it.

We congratulate you upon the bright prospects in the West! In preferring principles to men, Kentucky has preserved her former standing in the Union, and merited another tribute of gratitude from the Republic: her triumph must have a permanent influence upon the destiny of our free country; it has shown, that talents and services, unaccompanied by political honesty, cannot control a virtuous people; the lesson is salutary to electors and candidates

---

*In 1824, Pennsylvania gave to

Andrew Jackson	36100
J. Q. Adams	5440
W. H. Crawford	4206
Henry Clay	1696

† *From the National Intelligencer, Jan, 28, 1823.*

Appointment by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

ANDREW JACKSON, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Government of Mexico.

very where: Mr. Jefferson relied upon his "favorite west," as the sheet anchor of public liberty,—and we glory in the conviction, that this anticipation will be realized!

It is for us, in Pennsylvania, to keep our distinguished position, as "the great prop of the republican cause:" No doubt must exist of our continued devotion to those principles, which are essential to our political safety and personal advantage.

Yours, very respectfully,

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

September 1st, 1828.

Extracts of Letters from Committees of Correspondence, &c.

VIRGINIA.—"The members of our legislature, acting in their individual capacity, appointed a central committee at this place, (Richmond) and committees in each county and principal town in the State, to promote the election of Gen. Jackson and Mr. Calhoun: those committees have not been unmindful of the trust confided to them; in truth, however, little was necessary in this State; *the people* had taken the subject into their own hands, and will support the republican ticket of electors, *with a zeal and unanimity unexampled in our political annals.* We have one hundred and five counties, besides boroughs in this State, entitled to representation, and of these not more than *fifteen* will give a majority for Mr. Adams, and in several of these there will be strong minorities. Among the Jackson counties are some of the largest in the State, and in many of these Mr. Adams will not obtain more than 30 or 40 votes: In the aggregate in the State, Gen. Jackson will receive five votes to one for Mr. Adams.

"We are fully aware of the misrepresentations made by some of the friends of the administration, as to their strength in various parts of the Union; thus Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia have been alternately claimed: But these devices, so often exposed, like the unfounded charges against Gen. Jackson, have defeated the purposes of their authors.

"In relation to PENNSYLVANIA, no man at all acquainted with our political history could entertain a doubt of her consistency: From the time of the election of Jefferson to the present time, *your great and patriotic State has* been the most firm supporter of correct principles, and every well informed politician has looked upon her as *the great prop of the republican cause:* PENNSYLVANIA, which was the first to support the election of Gen. Jackson, will be the last to relax in his cause: VIRGINIA will be found side-by-side, with her valued and respected sister PENNSYLVANIA (as she has frequently been) supporting republican principles, such as prevailed in the auspicious era of Mr. Jefferson's election. The central committee most cordially reciprocate congratulations on the happy prospect of a glorious triumph."

NEW YORK.—"We are not surprised to hear from you, that the great State of PENNSYLVANIA, 'the key-stone of the federal arch,' is true to Gen. Jackson—that is, the cause of Reform and Liberty. She was the first to appreciate his eminent services to his country, and to express her grateful estimation of them; and upon this, as on all questions of importance to the republic, her course has been equally patriotic and disinterested. In NEW YORK, she will find *a firm and zealous auxiliary* in the same great cause—*never was the republican party in our State more united or powerful, or success more certain or triumphant.*

"We have intelligence from every part of the State of the most pleasing nature, which we shall recapitulate at the close of this letter—we cannot be mistaken in saying, there is no possibility of the Tennessee farmer and patriot having less than 24 electoral votes, and we are not without hopes of giving him more.

RECAPITULATION.

Dis.	*Counties.*	*J.*	*A.*	*H.*
1.	Suffolk and Queens			1
2.	Kings, Richmond & Rockland	1		
3.	New York	3		
4.	Westchester and Putnam	1		
5.	Dutchess	1		
6.	Orange	1		
7.	Ulster and Sullivan	1		
8.	Columbia		1	
9.	Rensselaer			1
10.	Albany	1		
11.	Green and Delaware	1		
12.	Schoharie and Schenectady	1		
13.	Otsego	1		
14.	Oneida		1	
15.	Herkimer	1		
16.	Montgomery		1	
17.	Saratoga	1		
18.	Washington		1	
19.	Franklin, Clinton, Essex and Warren	1		
20.	Oswego, Jefferson, Lewis and St. Lawrence	2		
21.	Chenango and Broome	1		
22.	Madison and Cortlandt	1		
23.	Onondaga	1		
24.	Cayuga	1		
25.	Tompkins and Tioga	1		
26.	Ontario, Seneca, Wayne & Yates		2	
27.	Monroe and Livingston	1		
28.	Cattaragus, Steuben and Alleghaney			1
29.	Genessee and Orleans			1
30.	Chatauque, Erie and Niagara		1	
		22	7	4
Majority gives 2 additional electors		2		
		24	7	4

NEW JERSEY.—"Your communication of the flattering propects of success in the cause in which we are united heart and hand, has been received, for which we tender you our thanks. Your assurances of Pennsylvania are a further proof of what we never could entertain a serious doubt. We could not do such injustice to her character, as to suppose she would abandon the

man of her deliberate choice, with such increased inducements to sustain him; although we cannot look forward with equal certainty of success in New Jersey, yet our prospects are truly flattering, and many think this State will go for Jackson. This opinion has not been hastily formed, but rests on information received from different parts of the State, we think, can be relied on. Perhaps in no part of New Jersey has the change been greater than in the county of Essex. The candid among our opponents have estimated the majority with which they started of 2500 to six or seven, and we confidently think they will not have five hundred: should such be the result, and our information from other parts of the State be correct, we must succeed. The following is our present calculation.

Counties.	Majorities. *Jackson.*	Majorities. *Adams.*
Cape May		100
Salem		100
Gloucester, divided		
Cumberland	250	
Burlington		700
Monmouth	400	
Hunterdon	800	
Warren	400	
Somerset	250	
Sussex	1000	
Middlesex		150
Essex		500
Morris	300	
Bergen		50
	2100	1600

You observe this result renders the election a close one: we think it will be so: but in many of the counties where we expect majorities we have put them less than we anticipate. We feel satisfied that we are constantly gaining, and should nothing occur to produce a re-action, our numbers will increase before the election."

OHIO.—"Your circular has been gladly received: Assure yourselves of our faithful co operation: the conflict in this State is a warm one, but, encouraged by the example of the friends of liberty in other States, we continue to maintain the cause of the people with increasing prospects of ultimate success. We can positively assure you, that our cause is gaining ground throughout the whole western country: Ohio is now the field of great efforts: the whole power and patronage of the government is openly brought to bear upon us, but we strive to turn their weapons back upon them. As to Kentucky—Although Mr. Metcalfe is elected, it is, you see, by an insignificant majority, whilst a majority in both houses of the legislature are for Jackson, as well as the Lieutenant Governor: Judge Barry lost his election on new court principles: there will no doubt be a majority for Jackson of from 7000 to 10000 votes.—Illinois has elected all her officers, general and State, from the friends of Jackson.—Indiana has re-elected a Jackson Governor, and a large majority in both houses of the legislature; notwithstanding the Congress results spoken of, nobody doubts that this State is decidedly Jacksonian.—The contest in Ohio is now doubtful: both parties claim a majority; our own impressions are that we shall succeed: the people are awakened to inquiry, that is all we want, and our efforts to give information must increase with their demand. We confidently believe we shall prevail: our opponents are alarmed, and not without cause. On the 30th (August) the citizens of three counties will meet at this place: we shall notice the "travelling cabinet," although the people seem disgusted enough at it already."

KENTUCKY.—"There were 77,271 votes given for Governor: Gen. Metcalfe has but 609 majority! our candidate for Lieutenant Governor has 1087 majority. Rest assured, no event in the womb of time is more certain, than that Jackson will get the electoral vote of Kentucky."

MISSOURI.—"Your application for information is received: we reply without a resort to conjecture or opinion, by stating the fact, that our general election is just (Aug. 17) over, that the presidential question was brought to bear upon it, and that the result is a clear majority of about 3000 votes: This, however, is not the entire strength of the Jackson cause in this State; circumstances, not necessary to be stated, prevented the perfect union of the party at the last contest; we shall give the electoral ticket at least four thousand majority."

MARYLAND.—"Our sanguine friends say *seven;* we say *six* electoral votes for the Tennessee Farmer, certain; the timid say *five.* The result of the whole election is important, not only to ourselves and posterity, but positively to the civilized world: the men, who have got into the house at the back door, hold on with the grasp of a drowning man on the last plank; but out they must go."

LETTER XVII.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Laurence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Jr. Esquires—Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of the 7th July.

Gentlemen—The question, to which, in the present letter, we beg leave to call your own, and the public, attention, is this.... *Why did Mr. Adams desert the Federal party?* To suppose, that you, the ardent advocates of Mr. Adams, and one of you his confidential friend, can be ignorant, upon the most extraordinary event in his political life, is to do violence to all parties: he would not think of soliciting, or of profiting by, your zeal, without confidence on his part; and, surely, you would not support him, whilst loaded with suspicion: We pray you, then, to remove a veil that has hitherto concealed transactions, involving not merely the reputation of Mr. Adams, but the political integrity and personal honor of a considerable portion of the people of the United States.

....In our last letter we reached the spring of 1807, the fortieth year, we think, of Mr. Adams's life: At that time, we saw him, like a determined and skilful general, marshalling the federalists of Massachusetts, in preparation for the important State election, then at hand: The election took place, and, for the first time, in Massachusetts, the entire federal force was routed; and the positions of governor, legislature, and all others dependent upon them, fell into republican hands. The joy that beamed upon the countenances of one party, was signally contrast-

ed with the gloom that overcast those of the other: The mass of the federalists, every where, regarded Massachusetts as their citadel, and when that fell, many among them relinquished all hopes of future political ascendancy.

Nor were these prognostics confined to the state of things, in Massachusetts: No indication was given any where, that an attempt, even to nominate a federal candidate to the presidency would be made—public opinion had settled down upon Mr. Madison, as the successor of Mr. Jefferson; and although there were some vagrant wishes for George Clinton of New York, his republican integrity guaranteed a pursuance of the Jefferson policy, in public affairs, foreign and domestic.

Such, then, was the condition of the two parties in 1807—the republicans every where triumphant, with a certainty that power would rest in their hands until 1816, at least: The federalists, every where in the minority; and, although, with their aggregate minorities, still respectable in numbers-as well as energy, destitute of the power, which alone attaches mercenary men, to pay in offices for integrity to their cause.

It must be confessed, that, at such a time as this, no man of good and generous feelings, to say nothing of political honesty, would sit down and deliberately weigh the chances of personal benefit, from an adherence to old friends, or a desertion to hereditary enemies. The wreck of a once powerful and in talent at least respectable, party, now scattered upon the political breakers, would have aroused the sympathies, even of opponents, to protect the scattered crew from injury and insult, rather than to pluck from them the only treasure that they had been able to preserve.

And if such should have been the conduct of republicans, in relation to their now powerless opponents; if it would have been patriotic, and kind in them, to conciliate men long estranged —to prove that difference in political sentiment did dot render the heart callous, what ought to have been the conduct of Mr. J. Q. Adams? If he possessed any power, influence, or wealth, to whom was he indebted for it?—Was it not to the very party which he now saw in the deepest adversity? If that party had sunk into public odium, had not the passions of his own father greatly contributed to their fall? Had they not, but lately before, given him a most striking proof of confidence and favor, by sending him to the Senate of the United States, in preference even to their veteran, Mr. Pickering!

Yet, unmindful of all this, it was in this hour of deep despondency, that Mr Adams fled from the colors of his political house, and entered the ranks of its uniform opponents!

Let it not he supposed, gentlemen, that we censure the abandonment of measures or of men, found to be mischievous: let no one say, that we object to the conversion of those who differ from us in political sentiment: on the contrary, we hail honest conversion as beneficial to the political institutions, and to the social happiness of our country: we know many, very many, who, having become convinced of error, as to the views and feelings of the republican party, are now attached to it. But we are not able to see, in the *life*, *principles*, or *acts*, of Mr. Adams, those indications which *precede*, *accompany*, and *follow* conversion: we have not seen in him a convert, but an informer against one party, in order to be received into and destroy another—a deserter, not disgusted with his old principles, but alarmed at the political nakedness of his old friends—an ally, not attracted by republican simplicity, but by the capacity to gratify his insatiable lust of ambition and avarice.

....We have already shown, that, from his youth to his fortieth year, Mr. Adams *wrote*, *spoke*, and *acted* against republican *principles*, *measures*, and *men*: He had never, we believe, from weakness of nerves, or mildness of disposition, halted between two opinions: he had never been known to change a sentiment, as men of moderation do, gradually—or as men of ardent temperament do, suddenly: so far as we can judge, he had been, from nature and education, what is termed obstinate, dogmatic: and in politics especially, he had been what is well understood by the term an *ultra*: so keen were his resentments, that, it has been alleged, he even indulged in the most offensive invective against Mr. Jefferson, under the poet's mask.

It is a matter of public concern, and not of mere curiosity, then, to ascertain what produced one of the most extraordinary political metamorphoses, which the annals of party describe. If Mr. Adams had gradually retired, and relinquished former principles and associations, all men would have acknowledged the sincerity of conversion: if he had sought to assuage the violence of his former partisans, or merely to expose the pernicious tendency of their course, he would have merited the gratitude of his country: if, when he saw them on the verge of mischief and punishment, he had sought to arrest the one, and prevent the other, the goodness of his heart would have been manifest. But, in vain do we seek such traits as these: Mr. Adams' change was sudden and unlimited: and, to all appearance, his antipathies and his attachments were at once given up, with as much composure and tact, as a veteran comedian exhibits, in the preparation for various parts of the plays in which he acts: He did not change from an extreme federalist to a moderate federalist, or even to a moderate republican —but to an absolute zealot in the ranks of the party by which his father and himself had been deprived of all power, and against which his father and himself had written with pens dipped in gall.

Can you explain to us, gentlemen, how this most singular result was brought about? Were the motives of Mr. Adams pure and patriotic? if they were, what can so well promote his cause now, as to make them known to the people? You must be aware, that many good men of both the parties in our country, object to Mr. Adams, especially for his conduct in 1807–8 —what can be so necessary, then, to his own fame, and indeed to your own political reputation, as his supporters, as a many explanation of the *causes* of his change of political party? But, if all such explanation shall be refused, we must of necessity form our own conclusions—and, in that case, what think you, gentlemen, of this sentiment of Mr. John Adams:—

"If a family, which has been high in office,
"and splendid in wealth, falls into decay,
"from profligacy, folly, vice, or misfortune,

"they generally turn democrats, and court "the lowest of the people, with an ardor, "an art, a skill, and consequently with a "success, which no vulgar democrat can "attain." *Cunningham Letters: VI.*

....Do you recognise no features in this picture, that bring Mr. Adams to your contemplation? His family had sunk into decay, from causes which need no explanation; his political family, too, had lost all influence, in the disposition of power. That he turned democrat, is his own boast; and that he has since done what has brought blushes into many democratic cheeks, the history of the times establishes. For instance....

1. In March 1807, Mr. Adams presided at the great federal convention in Massachusetts; in the next month the federal party was routed in the State: in the next October, Mr. Adams resumed his seat in the Senate of the U. S.: on the 13th December, Mr. Jefferson sent his message to Congress recommending an embargo: in the Senate, Mr. Jefferson had a large majority of political, and many personal friends: some of them asked to put off a decision of so momentous a subject, even for one day: if it was right to proceed, as Mr. Jefferson desired, at once, he had friends able and disposed to say so, and did not stand in need of the support of Mr. Adams—but Mr. Adams had fallen into decay, and now saw the moment, at which to turn democrat: he arose, and said, not merely that he was for proceeding at once, but...."I would not deliberate—I would act; "I doubtless the president possesses such further "information, as will justify the measure:" no dependant upon the will of a despot could descend lower than this:—even from a republican confidant of Mr. Jefferson, such a sentiment would have been impolitic, unsound, and unmanly; but from Mr. Adams, it must have been listened to with amazement, as well as disgust. But thus he "courted the people." Soon after, although Mr. Jefferson had the pens of hundreds of able men to defend his acts, Mr. Adams volunteered in his cause, and wrote a labored defence of the embargo!

2. But these acts, bold as they were, did not limit the zeal of Mr. Adams: "He most unexpectedly, but avowedly," says Governor Giles, "made a complete political somerset from the federal to the republican party." "How was this done? It was first done by a most solemn communication to myself, and afterwards to Mr. Jefferson, as I am well informed." "At the time Mr. Adams made a disclosure to me, he imposed no injunction of secrecy whatever: he spoke of the occasion, however, as one of awful magnitude—nothing less than hazarding the severance of the Union." After quoting a letter from Mr. Jefferson to him, on this subject, Mr. Giles proceeds: "Hence the following facts evidently appear: that Mr. Adams made the disclosure to me of his intending to desert the federal party, in the winter of 1807–8—to the best of my recollection, a short time previous to the first embargo: that it was made under the most solemn assurances of his patriotism and disinterestedness, and of an entire exemption of all views of personal promotion by the party to which he had proselyted. Mr. Jefferson states the grounds of this charge, as communicated by Mr. Adams himself, to be *the treasonable views of the federal party, and those treasonable views extended to disunion.*"

In short, gentlemen, as you know, Mr. Adams accused the federal party of being engaged in a conspiracy to dismember the Union: and made this the pretext for his conversion!

3. Although Mr. Adams professed disinterestedness, in all this, who can believe him? A man who deserts any cause, must, if he has any feeling at all, prefer retirement to exposure, if for no other reason, to avert suspicion as to his motives: no such sentiment seems to have ruled Mr. Adams: he did, indeed, when the federalists in Massachusetts, in 1808, unexpectedly regained power, resign his seat in the Senate of the United States; but in doing so, he sought to persuade the republicans that he was a sort of political martyr, and he certainly produced the desired effect!

4. Mr. Jefferson, to whom Mr. Adams made his disclosure of the treasonable designs of the federal party, profited by the disclosure, we presume, so far as to watch the movements in Massachusetts especially—but he gave no reward to the informer!

5. No sooner, however, was Mr. Madison elected, than, on the very day of his inauguration, March 4, 1809, he nominated Mr. Adams minister to Russia: the Senate did not confirm the nomination; and it was not until the extraordinary session, in the same year, that Mr. Adams ascended the first step to Republican promotion.

6. In 1814, he was minister at Ghent: subsequently at London, and at last in 1820, entered the cabinet, having thus with "ardor, art, and skill," successfully reached a point, to which many distinguished republicans, even Mr. Clay himself, aspired in vain.

7. Whilst Secretary of State, he delivered an oration on the anniversary of independence, which brought blushes into the cheeks of every Republican, who respected his country or himself—much as the Republicans had always dreaded the contaminating influence of England, and greatly as they disliked the English form of government, they were shocked and disgusted at the strain of invective in Mr. Adams' oration, against a nation, with which we were at peace—an oration, in which the insanity of the king of England was referred to with a levity, if not profaneness, unworthy of a generous nation; that it was intended to "court the lowest of the people," may be true, but we know no people in this country, so debased as to be gratified with such arts.

8. After his elevation to the Presidency of the Union, we witnessed another such resemblance to the picture drawn by Mr. J. Adams: we all remember the toast, so offensive, not to the memory of General Ross, not to the British nation, merely, but to every generous spirit! with a coldness and rancor, unworthy of the "lowest of the people," we heard the President of this great country speak of speeding a bullet into the breast of a brave foe!—for what was all this but to "court the lowest of the people!"

9. The spirit which actuated Ferdinand and the inquisition of Spain to persecute a body of men, called free-masons, having unaccountably reached this country, where it has been basely

prostituted to electioneering purposes; a person in the interior of New-York wrote to Mr. Adams recently, to know whether he was a free-mason, and telling him if he was not, it would help his election to make it known—instead of throwing such a note under the table, Mr. Adams, with the zeal of Ferdinand himself, set down and wrote a repiy, saying, not merely that he was not a mason, but that he never would be one!

10. It would be below the character of letters like the present to describe other instances of popular courtship: we saw Mr. Adams stripping off his coat, before a multitude, merely to perform the ceremony of lifting a root: we saw him ride....we forbear.

....But, gentlemen, let us not further digress: Mr. Adams fell into decay—he turned democrat—he courted "the lowest of the people," as well as their agents, "with an "ardor, an art, a skill, and consequently, with "a success, which no vulgar democrat can attain."

Is this the portrait which we must look upon as faithful? If the likeness is true, is the original worthy of our suffrages? If the resemblance is not faithful, why do you not point out the dissimilarity?

....If it was not the intoxicating influence of ambition and avarice which induced Mr. Adams to make so sudden and so surprising a change—what else was it? If Mr. Adams did not desert one party and fly to another for mere mercenary views, *why did he desert? Is it true*, that the federal party was conspiring to sever the Union? Mr. Adams says they were: and Mr. Adams is your candidate! It is not the republicans, who charge the federalists with being conspirators; the charge of conspiracy to sever the Union is made by Mr. Adams himself! *Is it true* that the federal party did conspire? *If they did*, then we call on the people of the Union to look and behold the mass of the same federal party now the main prop of Mr Adams's falling house! *If they did not conspire*, then we call on the people of the Union to look and behold the mass of the same federal party, which Mr. Adams thus denounced, cheering him as their candidate!

The spectacle is positively appalling! there is nothing like it, in the history of this, or perhaps in that of any country: with the exception of a very few federalists, few when compared with the mass—the party which Mr. Adams abandoned, which he denounced as conspirators against their countrymen, is now arrayed in his support! Mr. Otis, Mr. Quincy, Mr. Webster, Mr. Lowell, Mr. Dwight—besides many members of the Hartford Convention, are united to elevate the man, who stamped "conspirator to dissolve the Union" upon their foreheads!

....Can you, gentlemen, explain all this? Did Mr. Adams conspire with federalists, to go over to us republicans, in order to betray us? Is the union now existing between Mr. Adams and the federalists of New England the consummation of such a conspiracy?....Or, did Mr. Adams turn democrat to promote his own ends?....Or, did he truly accuse the federal party?....Or, did he falsely impute to them treasonable designs? These are questions to which we crave your attention.

The point to which we call public attention is this: a cordial union now exists between Mr. Adams and the mass of the party, which, Mr. Adams declared, conspired to dissolve the Union: Is it safe or honorable, to elect a person, who, according to his own account, must have had a full knowledge of a conspiracy, who did not betray it until the republicans had got the power into their own hands, and who has now again thrown himself into the arms of the same conspirators?

....As to the federal party of New England, for we consider the mass of the federalists of the rest of the Union to be the disciples of Washington, rather than the slaves of an eastern aristocracy, who can doubt that they deserved the character given to them by Mr. Adams? Would any man of spirit, or of common honesty, support the person, who had falsely accused him?

You, gentlemen, can set aside all doubt and suspicion: *Why did Mr. Adams desert the federal party?*

Respectfully, yours, &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan 8th, 1828.

Sept. 8, 1828.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Esqs. —Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of the 7th July.

GENTLEMEN:—In the letters which we have addressed to you, we have, we believe, said, that we were not aware of error, and our readiness to correct it, if discovered.

Our attention has been called to our tenth letter, in which we referred to the civil offices conferred on Gen. Jackson.

In that letter, we stated, that Washington had appointed Andrew Jackson attorney of the district, now Tennessee, under the act of Congress organizing that territory, of May 26, 1790, and then, in a note, we presented the form of a commission to Gen. Jackson as district attorney.

It has been represented—

1. That the statement made by us, as to the appointment, is unfounded:
2. That the form of a commission, annexed in a note to our tenth letter, was presented by us for purposes of deception:

1. *As to the first assertion*, we say: we regarded the fact of the appointment of Andrew Jackson, by Washington, historical and undoubted: it had never, to our knowledge, been contradicted, although long before the public: In the life of Andrew Jackson, written by John H. Eaton, Esq. it is stated—that Gen. Jackson had settled in Tennessee in 1788—that he had established himself there as a lawyer—and

"Shortly afterwards, he was appointed, by "Washington, Attorney General for the "district, in which capacity he continued "for several years---

As Gen. Eaton had not fixed the time of appointment, we referred to the laws U. S. and from the date of the organization of the district, and the statement of Gen. Eaton as to the time when Gen. Jackson established himself, concluded that Gen. Jackson was the first attorney.

2. *As to the second assertion*, we say, that it is contradicted by the very note objected to: We had no sort of doubt of the correctness of the grave declaration of Gen. Eaton; we implicitly believed, and we still believe, that Gen. Jackson was appointed by Washington: To show, in as prominent a way as we could, what it was that Washington had done for Gen. Jackson, we gave, in a note, appended to our tenth letter, *the form of a commission*, (copied from an original commission of 1789, from Washington to a district attorney) giving the name, place, and date as we believed they must be in the original, which we had no doubt had been given to Gen. Jackson. In our note, we did not give the paper as the commission given to General Jackson: we did not give it as the copy even: we gave a form, just as we believed the original to be; and designated its character, not only by the name given to it, but by our statement, that we could not be certain as to the date. In short, we intended to present, if we may so say, the picture of the appointment which we believed had been given.

Gen. Eaton, who is the authority for our statement as to the appointment, will be able to remove doubt, if doubt exists: For ourselves, we have given the facts as they were and are---not conscious, and, as we know ourselves to be, not capable of unfairness.

Respectfully, yours, &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

Sept. 8, 1828.

LETTER XVIII.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Jun. Esquires,—Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of the 7th July.

GENTLEMEN—The remarks, which we propose to make in the present letter, although deserving, as we trust, the attention of men of all parties, are particularly designed for that portion of our fellow citizens who declare themselves federalists of the Washington school. Difference of opinion will exist, and difference of opinion will produce a variety of designation; but it is the extreme of tyranny to frown upon a fellow citizen for his exercising the right, which it is the boast of us all to possess. The soundness of a man's political sentiments and professions is to be tested by his *actions*—no one would dare to doubt the purity of the intentions of those, who, in an hour of peril, would risk life and fortune for their country; but, the patriotism of those may well be doubted, *who, in the moment of danger, would convulse their country*, and cover it with blood, rather than not gratify their selfish views.

That there have been, and are, two descriptions of federalists in this country, no man of discernment can doubt—the first consists of those whom Mr. John Adams calls the "high oligarchy"—men swollen with wealth, and goaded by the desire to exhibit its possession by all the pomp and circumstance of aristocratic state—men, who consider themselves born to guide the destinies of a nation—men, who think a republic a sort of visionary scheme, that has never lasted, and that never can last long—men, who would convulse their country, to dispel this political mist, as they consider it, which obscures the brightness of their own fancied superiority.

The other party consists of sound and discreet men, who really love liberty, but still, from the impressions made upon them by the first class, conceive that there is a tendency in the republican party to run into the abuses of a government purely popular—they, however, cherish the union of the States, and upon all occasions of danger offer their purses and persons in their country's cause.

It is to the sober minds and the pure hearts of this last description of our fellow citizens, that we now address ourselves. They are mistaken in supposing that there is any tendency in the republican party to run into abuses, which, in fact, *cannot exist in our representative system*—they are mistaken in supposing that the republicans willingly exclude them, as the Catholics of Ireland are excluded, from places of trust, profit or honor—they are mistaken if they suppose, that the republicans have any other wish or interest, but to promote the political union of the States, the permanency of the constitution, and the substantial welfare of all the people.

But, if it is asked, why the republicans have appeared to be intolerant, *we point at once to the cause*—the republicans have rarely seen the moderate or *liberal* federalists separate themselves from the ultra federalists. When Mr. Jefferson came into power, although he said the people were "all federalists—all republicans," he was restrained from conferring political stations upon both, by public opinion, which pointed to the extreme doctrines and actions under Mr. Adams, as denoting *anti-republican tendencies*. If the sound men who consult the counsel of Washington, had always had that counsel before their eyes, they would not have thrown their influence into the scale of a New England aristocracy, that has long meditated a separation of the Union—an evil, of all others, which Washington deprecated. Let us hear his voice first, and then see how it was attended to:

"The unity of government," (said Washington, in his farewell address) "which constitutes "you one people, is also dear to you. It is "justly so; for it is the main pillar in the edi- "fice of your independence, the support of

"your tranquility at home, your peace abroad; "of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very "liberty which you so highly prize. But as "it is easy to foresee, that from different "causes, and from different quarters, *much "pains will be taken, many artifices employed,* "to weaken in your minds the conviction of "this truth; as this is the point in your political "fortress, against which the batteries of *inter-"nal* and *external* enemies will be most con-"stantly and actively (though often covertly "and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite mo-"ment, that you should properly estimate "the immense value of your national union, to "your collective and individual happiness; that "you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and "immovable attachment to it; accustoming "yourselves to think and speak of it as the Pal-"ladium of your political safety and prosperity; "watching for its preservation with jealous "anxiety; discountenancing whatever may sug-"gest even a suspicion that it can in any event "be abandoned; and indignantly frowning up-"on the first dawning of every attempt to "alienate any portion of our country from the "rest, or to enfeeble *the sacred ties*, which now "link together the various parts."

....Such is the advice of him, whom all aver a veneration for: Who have followed this counsel? who have rejected it?

Have the republicans of the east, middle, south or west, ever, in the slightest degree, sought to enfeeble the *sacred ties* uniting the States?

Have the federalists of the east, or of any other quarter of the Union, conspired to destroy the Palladium of our political safety and prosperity?

We put these questions to all good men. We say, in answer to the first, that the republicans are guiltless of this sin. In answer to the second, we say, on various authorities, to which we shall refer, that the federalists of the east have disregarded this counsel of Washington, and conspired to sever the Union.

1. In the preface to Mr. M. Carey's Olive Branch, *2d edition, page* 6, it is thus written:

"It cannot be any longer doubted that there exists a conspiracy in New England, among a few of the most influential and wealthy citizens, to effect a dissolution of the Union at every hazard, and to form a separate confederacy. This has been asserted by some of our citizens for years, and strenuously denied by others, deceived by the mask the conspirators wore, and their hollow professions. But it requires more than Bœotian stupidity and dulness to hesitate on the subject, after the late extraordinary movements, which cannot possibly have any other object. It is eighteen years since this dangerous project was promulgated. (In a series of essays published under the signature of Pelham, in the Connecticut Courant, 1796.) From that period to the present, it has not been one hour out of view. And unholy and pernicious as was the end, the means employed were at least as unholy and pernicious: falsehood, deception, and calumny, in turn, have been called in to aid the design:" &c.

The pages of Mr. Carey's work are adorned with the political portraits of Mr. Webster, Mr. Lowell, Mr. Otis, Mr. Quincy, and others now actively promoting, with the members of the Hartford Convention, the re-election of Mr. Adams—the same Mr. Adams who promulgated to Mr. Giles and Mr. Jefferson, the existence of a conspiracy in New England to dissolve the Union.

2. In the Cunningham Letters, Boston edition, page 66 to 70, will be found a letter from Mr. John Adams to Mr. Cunningham, dated "December 13th, 1803," containing these words:

"I may mention to you in confidence, that con-'siderable pains have been taken to persuade 'your friend John Q. Adams to consent to be 'run [for Governor of Massachusetts] by the 'republicans. *But he is utterly averse to it,* 'and so am I, for many reasons, among which 'are (for 6 of them see book)—7. It would 'produce an eternal separation between him 'and the federalists, at least that part of them 'who now constitute the absolute obligarchy. 'This, I own, however, I should not much re-'gret, for *this nation has more to fear from 'them than any other source.*"

Thus, we see, that although Mr. J. Q. Adams denounced this very oligarchy, to Mr. Jefferson, in the winter of 1807-8, he still clung to them in December 1808, and would not act with the republicans—We see him balancing, as the political thermometer varied: And above all, we see, on the authority of Mr. John Adams, that from the New England faction, now at the head of Mr. J. Q. Adams's supporters, 'this nation has more to fear than from any other source.'

3. We next refer to the message of the President of the U. S. to Congress, communicating the disclosures, made by John Henry, the agent employed by the Governor General of Canada, &c. to proceed on a political mission to the United States.

Extract from J. Henry's memorial to Lord Liverpool, of the 13th June, 1811.

"Soon after the affair of the Chesapeake frigate, when his Majesty's Governor General of British America had reason to believe that the two countries would be involved in a war, and had submitted to his Majesty's Ministers the arrangements of the English party in the United States for an efficient resistance to the General Government, which would probably terminate in a separation of the Northern States from the general confederacy, he applied to the undersigned, to undertake a mission to *Boston, where the whole concerns of the opposition were managed.* The object of the mission was to promote and encourage the federal party *to resist the measures of the general government; to offer assurances of aid and support from his Majesty's government of Canada;* and to open a communication between the leading men engaged in that opposition, and the Governor General, upon such a footing as circumstances might suggest; and finally, to render the plans then in contemplation subservient to the views of his Majesty's government."

Extract of a letter from John Henry to Sir James Craig, governor general of British America, dated Boston, March 7, 1809.

"Sir—I have already given a decided opinion that a declaration of war is not to be expected;

but, contrary to all reasonable calculations should the Congress possess spirit and independence enough to place their popularity in jeopardy by so strong a measure, the Legislature of Massachusetts will give the tone to the neighboring States, will declare itself permanent until a new election of members; invite a Congress, to be composed of Delegates from the Federal States, and erect a separate Government for their common defence and common interest."

Extract from the same to the same, dated Boston, March 20, 1809.

"Since the plan of an organized opposition to the projects of Mr. Jefferson was put into operation, the whole of the New England States have transferred their political power to his political enemies; and the reason that he has still so many adherents, is, that those who consider the only true policy of America to consist in the cultivation of peace, have still great confidence, that nothing can force him (or his successor, who acts up to his system, or rather is governed by it) to consent to war.

"A war attempted without the concurrence of both parties, and the general consent of the Northern States, which constitute the bone and muscle of the country, must commence without hopes, and end in disgrace. It should, therefore, be the peculiar care of Great Britain, to *foster division between the North and South*; and by succeeding in this, she may carry into effect her own projects in Europe, with a total disregard of the resentments of the democrats of this country."

4. We all remember the gloomy period, August and Sept. 1814, when Washington city was burnt, when a British army 14000 strong, under Sir John Prevost, was marching to Plattsburgh, and when the army under Gen. Ross, to divert attention from the North, was approaching Baltimore: at that period, there was published, in the Boston Centinel (to which Mr. J. Q. Adams has given the public printing, before held by a republican paper) a series of essays; the object of which may be judged from these extracts:

"She (New-England) will now meet every danger, and go through every difficulty, until her rights are restored to the full, and settled too strongly to be shaken. She will put aside all *half-way measures*; she will look with an eye of doubt on those who propose them; in the cause of *New-England Independence*, they must do it in the spirit of New-England men."

"Those who startle at the danger of a separation, tell us that the soil of *New-England* is hard and sterile: that deprived of the productions of the South, we should soon become a wretched race of cowherds and fishermen; that our narrowed territory, and diminished population would make us an easy prey to foreign powers."

"Do these men forget what *national energy* can do for a people? Have they not read of Holland? Do they not remember that it grew in wealth and power amidst contest and alarm: That it threw off the yoke of Spain, (our Virginia,) and its chapels became churches, and its poor men's cottages, Princes' palaces?"

"Do our men of moderation think that *opposition in all its horrors* will not then break out in New-England?"

"Could it be supposed, that the members of the New-England Convention would return each to his home, without proposing some measures going to our full relief and security? Who does not foresee, much as they are respected, that the sufferings of those who look up to them for blessings, will embitter their coming days, and darken their latest hour?"

"*Citizens of New-England*—With numerous consequences conjured up before your eyes, there are still a few *who have started at the sound of an Eastern neutrality, and a treaty of commerce with England.* They trembled too at the name of a *convention.*"

"It is said, that to *make a treaty of commerce with the enemy*, is to violate the Constitution and sever the Union. Are they not both already virtually destroyed?"

"Throwing off all connexion with this wasteful war—*making peace with our enemy*, and opening once more our commerce with the world, would be a wise and manly course. *The occasion demands it of us, and the people at large are ready to meet it.*"

5. In proof that the advice of the agent of England was acted upon, and every effort made to irritate the North against the South, we again refer to Mr. Carey's book, chapter 32: Mr. Carey asserts, that the demagogues of the Eastern States had "uniformly treated the Southern "States, with outrage, insult, and injury"—*page* 269: and that the Boston papers contained articles "intended and calculated to excite the ne-"groes of the Southern States to rise and mas-"sacre their masters"—*page* 254.

6. In 1801, the constitution U. S. did not authorize electors of President and Vice President, as it now does, to designate the person they preferred as President, and the person they preferred as Vice President: the electors gave in that year an equal number of votes to Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Burr; but it was well understood that Mr. Jefferson was intended as President and Mr. Burr as Vice-President: the election, however, devolving on the House of Representatives, the New England faction undertook to obstruct the popular will: although Mr. Burr was a republican as well as Mr. Jefferson, they pushed their support of the former, almost to a civil war, and if the federalists of the middle States had to the end adhered to them, that would have been the result. The States then voting were sixteen.

The public understand the character of the late Mr. James A. Bayard, who then represented and gave the vote of Delaware: we have now before us two original letters, written by him, at the memorable crisis refered to: the ballotings were carried on by night as well as day, for many days and nights, producing alarm and gloom throughout the Union: the first letter is dated, one o'clock at night, February 12, Chamber of Representatives, and states, that the House was then in session, balloting—that 19 times the ballots had been given in, and produced the same result, 8 votes for Jefferson, 6 for Burr, and two divided: "how or when the

affair will end," says Mr. Bayard, "we know not:" the balloting continued until the 17th February: on that day Mr. Bayard wrote the second letter before us, announcing that Mr. Jefferson was elected: and this letter contains these memorable words:

"The New England gentlemen came out, and "declared, they meant to go without a con-"stitution, and take the risk of a civil war."

Such a declaration was well calculated to open the eyes of men who really respected the counsel of Washington; and Mr. Jefferson, the candidate intended by the people, was placed in the presidency.

....We have thus given our proofs of the disposition of the New England faction to disregard the advice of Washington: and we now appeal to all discreet men to say, whether the distrust of federalists entertained by republicans is to be wondered at? "The ambitious dema-"gogues of Boston," says Mr. M. Carey, *page* 306, "have been the guide of federalists throughout the Union: they have lead them a de-"vious course, from the paths prescribed by "Washington: they have allured to the brink of "insurrection, civil war, and horrible devasta-"tion, which are all synonymous with a disso-"lution of the Union."

Is it surprising, then, we ask, if republicans have hesitated to put offices and power into the hands of persons who permit themselves to be thus led away? Let candid men reverse the scene, and for the instant suppose, that the demagogues of the west had acted like those of the east had done, and that the republicans of Pennsylvania had sustained the western misconduct; would not complaint be made with justice! If the Union is dear to us, if peace is so desirable, why cling to a faction that has threatened both?

To the discreet men, to the real disciples of Washington, we, therefore, say, come out from amongst them: show that you truly love your country, and not a section of it merely: that you are, in truth, the admirers of him, whose services and wishes embraced the whole American family. The people of New England at large, are virtuous, intelligent, and faithful; but it has unaccountably happened, that they have not had the resolution to resist a pressure upon them, from an interested aristocracy: but the federalists of other States give them an example, and they will cease to be guided as heretofore.

....Between Andrew Jackson and John Q. Adams there is a striking contrast, inviting the support of the former, on the part of men of principle—The one has always acted for his country—the other for himself. The one has always been of the republican party, and yet he has openly avowed his desire to honor and confide in men of all parties, who are true to their country in hours of danger. Mr. Adams, on the contrary, has been of every party and faction, and broken faith with them all. He is now undoubtedly the candidate of the very faction from which his father said the country has more to fear than from any other source. We ask, if, without the New England aristocracy Mr. Adams would have twenty votes? We ask discreet federalists to say, whether they are prepared to be again "guided" to the verge of mischief, or will act for their country?

If such counsel as we have given shall be disregarded, at least we shall have done our duty.

Respectfully, yours, &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

September 10th, 1828.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Shortly after Mr. Clay was in Kentucky, in 1827, Thomas Currey, known as an assistant Editor to the Kentucky Reporter, came on to this city, and report says, we know not how truly, is now supported on the bounty of the Secretary of State. He is, we are credibly informed, one of the writers for a scurrilous print published in this city under the patronage of the State Department, which, speaking of the Postmaster General, uses the following language:

"It may be a painful duty to dismiss him, 'but Mr. Adams must screw his courage to the 'sticking place, and do it. The Intelligencer, 'wide awake to the political opposition of Mr. 'McLean, proposes, by way of genteel rid-'dance, to tender him the vacant Judgeship on 'the bench of the Supreme Court, lately filled 'by Mr. Trimble, deceased; but we have no 'idea of any middle course in the matter; whilst 'there are *real* friends of the Administration, 'who would accept the appointment, it should 'never, with our consent, be given to a *sham* 'friend. The Intelligencer must be joking. 'Mr. McLean has had the weather-guage long 'enough against the Executive: and if he has 'any political merit to reward, we are ignorant 'of it. These are party times, and we speak 'and feel for our party, who are straining every 'nerve to maintain the good cause. With sur-'face politicians, and double-dealers, we have 'nothing to do."

And the same paper asserts—

"However, we do not wonder that some 'men make common cause with Jackson, be-'cause they know they are doomed to stand, or 'fall, with the hero."

We have long known that it was the intention of Mr. Clay to force the President to remove Mr. McLean. Nothing but the remonstrance of his more prudent friends prevented Mr. Adams from committing that act of political suicide last spring, and we now have the open declaration of one of his official organs, that he waits only to be confirmed in power to consummate his purpose: For, says the *Court* paper, speaking of the Post Master General and two of his Clerks: "They are doomed to stand or fall with the Hero."

Sign in Madison County, N. Y.—At an officer drill of the rifle regiment commanded by Col. Williams, on the 27th ult. in the village of Hamilton, a vote was taken on the Presidential question:—For Jackson 51, Adams 92.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH....*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published, weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, SEPTEMBER 27, 1828 No. 29.

From the New York Evening Post.

Mr. Adams's political character.—We commence to day the publication of a series of numbers lately received, on the political character of John Quincy Adams, examined particularly in relation to his claims upon the support of the federal party. We give them to the public with the more pleasure not only because they enable us to fulfil, better than we could do ourselves, a sort of promise under which we lie to take up this subject, but because they appear from intrinsic evidence to be the work of no common or obscure hand, and no immature or inexperienced judgment. We are gratified at this new proof for such it seems to us, that we still retain the confidence of those men of eminent talents and lofty and enlightened integrity, whose participation gives dignity to political controversy, and whose opinions add weight to the cause to which they incline.

The public life of Mr. Adams from the time when he abandoned the federal party, up to his election as President of the United States, has been passed in such a manner as to avoid, in a good degree, a strict public scrutiny. Had he, instead of receiving a series of executive appointments, been a candidate for offices in the gift of the citizens, there are many passages in his political history with which the public would be much more familiar than they are now. The industry of political rivals would have brought to light, and pressed upon the attention of the community many things now obscurely remembered. The essays, of which we now commence the publication, supply this deficiency. We recommend them to the particular notice of our federal readers, to whose bosoms we think they cannot fail of carrying the strongest conviction that Mr. Adams is a man wholly unworthy of their political confidence or support. Our correspondent who has desired us to enter into the examination of his claims upon the federal party, will find the subject discussed with an ability seldom brought to tasks of this kind.

The conduct of JOHN QUINCY ADAMS considered in his relations, political and moral, towards the FEDERAL PARTY.

No. I.

The most zealous party man in these times, will not contend that the measures, opinions, and conduct of any party are right in all things. The most moderate party man will admit that the principles of party fidelity ought to be respected, that it is strongly allied to honor, and has a powerful influence over honorable minds, that it cherishes many virtues and occasions but few faults. The mass of men do not (except on some great occasions) indulge in any strong party feelings, yet in a republic every one has his preference of parties. Those who have taken no trusts or honors from them, who have cherished no strong feelings of party attachment or party antipathy, although they have generally (accidentally perhaps) been associated with one party, are still free to choose another; and if they should abandon the one and join the other, in such the offence, if any, would be venial. Not so with those who have received high official trusts from a party, and have shared their confidence and their patronage. The violation of fidelity in them is as disgraceful as it would be in a general to betray the army which he commanded. A general has an unquestionable right to retire from his command when the service becomes disagreeable.—So a statesman having received a high office from a party has an unquestionable right to resign, when he is convinced that the measures which his party favour are injurious to the great interests of his country; but an honorable man would never remain in office to injure the party who placed him there. The violation of these honorable obligations has occasioned, in some great minds, such an agony of remorse as to induce them to seek relief from a miserable existence in a voluntary death: such was the fate of Lord Chancellor Yorke. "He was a man of spirit, (we are told,) he had a quick sense of shame, and death redeemed his character." The jealousy which the people always entertain of those statesmen who abandon the weaker to join the stronger party, is wise, salutary, and generous.

Parties, it is true, may be very opposite in their principles; yet, the individuals of each may cherish an equal degree of attachment to their common country: and if the difference between them be analysed, it may, perhaps be discovered, that it consists more in a difference of opinion as to the best mode of promoting the public good, than in any radical hostility to the national institutions:—much mischief may result from doing proper acts in an improper manner, but the motives of each party may be equally pure. It is the duty of all honest men to trust none but the most honest of their party associates, the best and most faithful friends—and it is equally their duty when some member of a rival party shall have rendered great and illustrious services to that country, which is the common parent of both, to award to him the full measure of glory and of gratitude. A generous mind would not withhold one tittle of applause from the patriot who has illustrated the national character by glorious achievments, although he may find just grounds to differ from the party with which the hero or the patriot is associated.

The political Arithmeticians, who, like *Burrers*, in the French convention, are constantly balancing probabilities, and counting chances and who, (when their calculations are completed,) proceed in their heartless course unswerved by feeling or principle, fearing the slightest deviation may risk their ultimate success, are of all those who engage in public affairs, the most dangerous. They look upon men as their counters, and never hesitate in the pursuit of personal objects to cut through all the ties which ought to bind man to man, leaving behind them the traces of ingratitude, falsehood dishonor and treachery. Such men, however

are seldom *trusted long*. Like *Burrere* they may escape punishment, but they cannot long escape the scorn and contempt of honest men of all parties.

There is also another class of worthless and dangerous politicians. Fisher Ames, somewhere, says:—"Some very vain men, and some very great hypocrites pretend to be of *no party*; while they arrogate to themselves a discernment superior to both parties, they affect to be neutral and undecided between them. They claim the title of truest patriots, and to love their country with the ardor of passion, yet they inconsistently condemn the violence of both parties, and expect to have both believe that the fire of their zeal subsists pure and unexpended in the frost of moderation. Such men are often flattered as Federalists, more often used as democrats, but always held in contempt, that is never more hearty than when it is discreetly suppressed." After Mr. Adams had served and used, and betrayed the Federal party: after he had served and used, and betrayed the Republican party, he places himself at the head of *no party*, and calls to his standard the apostates of all parties to form a *new party* and a personal party, without any basis of principle or policy except individual interest. He told the people of America, "that there still remained one effort of magnanimity, one sacrifice of prejudice and passion, to be made by individuals throughout the nation, who have heretofore followed the standards of political party—that of discarding every remnant of rancor against each other; of embracing as countrymen and friends, and of yielding to talents and virtue alone, that confidence, which, in times of contention for principle, was bestowed only upon those who bore the badge of party communion." These are very amiable, but very *heartless* words—such as ambition has always used, whether by the mouths of Cæsar, or Cromwell, or Richard III. —and I shall soon shew how much the conduct of this climber of "ambition's ladder" has comported with the spirit of his declarations. My present object is to exhibit the manner and the temper with which Mr. Adams embraced the republican party: the extent of his obligations to the party which he abandoned, and his conduct and treatment to them after it was in his power to confer, and when he was not under the necessity of asking favours: and how far his "change" furnishes evidence that he is in the "practice of all the moral virtues."*

The transition of John Quincy Adams from the federalists to the republicans, has marked his political life with its most striking trait.—Party history in America, had presented no such incident in any character of eminence. It was so unexpected, so strange and so alarming that men began to doubt whether such a quality as political honesty was cherished amongst statesmen. Many became apprehensive of the effect of the example upon the morality of the nation, when a distinguished leader of the federalists,—the son of John Adams, the defender of their measures and the sharer of their patronage when in power, and afterwards a chieftain of the opposition, without any apparent cause, abandoned and denounced them.

If some venerable federalist, whose hairs had whitened while his party waned; who had supported the elder Adams in the energetic measures of '98, and by his side had encountered the storm which drove him from office in 1801; who, having shared his prosperous fortune did not desert him in his downfall; whose tongue has not yet learned the soft and courtly language of his younger brethren;—in whose vocabulry apostacy has not yet usurped the name of magnanimity;—who cannot yet be induced to believe that unprincipled ambition is stern integrity;—who cannot yet confound the distinctions between selfishness and patriotism, falsehood and truth:—if such a man should now address him, we might presume the style of his rebuke would be somewhat like this:

"You have now attained the highest station that is accessible to an American citizen. The place from which your father was expelled has been regained by you: this event might be supposed to offer some alleviation to the wounded pride of those who had shared his disgrace, and some consolation for the political misfortunes and disasters which they endured for him.

"You was nurtured in the bosom of the federal party. They who had done so much for your father; elevated him to a station second only to that of Washington, and afterwards gave him that, illustrated and almost consecrated by the virtues and wisdom of the first President, feeling the strong impulse of hereditary affection, turned their eyes on you, as soon as your years rendered you constitutionally competent to receive the trusts and the honors of the republic.

"In your early youth, we cherished the fond hope that you would, on some day, succeed to your father's honors, and although you had given us no proof of any eminent qualification for high office, we took you on trust:—it was our influence which removed you from your humble lawyer's office, ("into which no client's feet were ever known to stray") and sent you on an honorable and important mission to Europe;—we gave you the office by which the foundation of your ample fortune was laid; a situation which afforded you the necessary leisure for literary pursuits, and enabled you to mingle with the literati, statesmen and nobility of the old world, and relieved you from the burthen of encountering the toil and odium which fell upon us in our fruitless endeavor to sustain your father's administration, and relieved you too, from the "painful duty" (as you would now have this nation believe) of "opposing your father's administration!" Yes, we did attempt to sustain him without your aid, and your pen so powerful in "intimidating Jacobins" confined its powers to courtly notes and complimentary communications.

"We daily saw that our cause was becoming more desperate, yet, we continued our support. We saw our most faithful and trusted leaders sacrificed and disgraced, not for the interest of the party, but for your father's personal interest. We saw the honest and able Pickering and the amiable McHenry dismissed from their places without an allegation or a pretence of misconduct, and still we were true to him. We witnessed his "forced retreat" from power, and we

* General Porter, in his late Address, said of Mr. Adams, "Learning, experience, a sound mind and chastened temper, *added to the practice of all the moral virtues*, define him the safe depository of power in a free government."

never faltered in our attachment. His successor addressed us in the language and peace and conciliation, but we preferred the friendship of John Adams, a private citizen destitute of power, to the patronage of Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States. Yet, we were charged with luke-warmness, neglect and insensibility. We endured the reproaches of the fallen statesman in compassion to his age and political misfortunes. He would have infused his fiery passions into our bosoms. He would have rekindled the flame of party animosity which was smouldering in the ashes—he would have fanned the expiring embers until they blazed into a conflagration wide enough to consume his rival and all who supported him.

"You returned from Europe. Our political hopes revived. The age of your father rendered him unequal to the exertion and the labour which was required in the chief of a party. We hailed your return with heart-felt gratulations. Our sinking hopes were animated by your presence, and we saw a new chieftain of the still idolized house of Braintree. A seat was immediately given you in the Senate of Massachusetts. We spared no exertion to drive out of Congress the popular Eustice, a veteran republican, and revolutionist, and to give his seat to you. We failed, but the closeness of the contest discovered the extent of our efforts. This defeat only strengthened our attachment, and you were chosen soon after by the Legislature of Massachusetts to the high and honorable office of Senator of the United States. Under what circumstances were you elected? You received no support from the republicans. They, at that time, would as soon have thought of Lord North in connexion with that office as any member of your father's family, but they were a minority. Who were our candidates? They were no ordinary competitors, no common-place statesmen, no party lumber. Amongst them was Timothy Pickering, a revolutionary officer of high distinction, honored and trusted by General Washington, who had successively held the offices of Postmaster General, Secretary of War, and Secretary of State. Henry Knox was another, a celebrated revolutionary general, the first Secretary of War, distinguished for every accomplishment civil and military, who not only shared the councils but the affections of Washington,—who not only shared his affections but was emphatically the man of all others whom Washington loved—a political philosopher as well as a military hero, with manners so affable, so dignified and so frank, that they would have graced the most polished court, a practised debater and an eloquent orator. Samuel Dexter was also a candidate, one of the most extraordinary men in the United States, who will long be remembered as the pride and ornament of the American bar, distinguished for his eloquence in Congress, a veteran statesman who had filled two offices in the cabinet. We rejected them all—the faithful and able Pickering, the gallant and accomplished Knox, the match less Dexter did we reject, because there was an Adams to be gratified!

"In this way the federal party opened the road to all your greatness. They presented you to the nation as a distinguished statesman. You adhered to our cause and our party with unwavering fidelity, until we lost our power in the State of Massachusetts, and until the democratic ascendency was established throughout the Union so universally, and to all appearance so firmly that we were left without hope. It was in that sad and fatal hour of "dim eclipse and disastrous twilight," "when the glory of our house had departed," and nothing was left to our political poverty but the proud consolation of having, according to our lights and our opinions, served our country with truth and fidelity, that we were destined to experience the deepest and most painful wound that was ever inflicted on our feelings. The shaft by which it was inflicted was launched from a hand which we had grasped in friendship—and it was poisoned." CATULLUS.

From the New York Evening Post.

CATULLUS.—No. 2.

If there is one federalist of the Hamilton school yet left, whose bosom swells with the remembrance of the days that are past, he is invited to peruse the ensuing number.

The conduct of JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, considered, in his relations, political and moral, towards the FEDERAL PARTY.

Same address continued.—"We had hitherto stood in the glory of our ancient honors; like some venerable tree, once the pride of the grove, which had endured the blast of a thousand wintry storms, yet still continued to wear the green livery of its youth, though its trunk was indented with lightning marks, and its limbs twisted and torn by whirlwinds—and, like that too, we found our ruin in the worm, the vile worm, which lurked at the root. Our opposition to the administration of Mr. Jefferson had been distinguished by much excitement of feeling, but in none were violence and uncompromising hostility more distinctly manifested than in you. However, in the party conflicts of that day, the combatants would sometimes pause to let the people know that they had some respect for each other. But their warfare soon assumed a character of unyielding animosity, of deep and inveterate rancor. To you may be traced that stern spirit of hostility, that enduring suspicion, which for twenty years has been cherished amongst the great democratic party in the United States against their federal brethren; a spirit far transcending the ordinary animosity of political rivalry, a spirit which has even blasted the prospects of many noble minded and talented democrats, who had been so unfortunate as to receive federal support, and so unwise as to accept it.

"Conscious of innocence, yet matter of accusation was found against them in their most innocent acts. Suspected and distrusted, they lived in their own country like strangers in a foreign land, like the Jews in Palestine, like the Greeks in the once proud Peloponessus, now the Turkish Morea. They lived on the lands of their fathers whose graves were scattered around them, but their penates were unknown gods. Deemed by their opponents to be unworthy of honor or trust, because they had plotted the dismemberment of the confederacy, they deemed themselves the victims of oppression. Suspicion hung over them like a cloud, as permanent as those which eternally brood over the far-distant seas of the South. In vain might a Van Rensse-

wreck point to his bleeding wounds. In vain might a Hull, a Decatur, a Bainbridge, or a Stewart, show their glorious flags triumphant in all any an ocean battle. In vain might a Perry or a MacDonough, open a new scene of glory amid the solitude of the lakes—the suspicion remained, and federalism and treachery were yet synonymeus.

"Time brings many dark transactions to light: some foul slanderer of the federal party, who infuses his poison into the minds of the three last Presidents, now stands revealed in the person of some of the most cherished of its sons. *It was left for you to accuse the federalists of a conspiracy to dismember the States, and of a design to form a confederacy with the British provinces of North America, and to establish a new government under the protection of Great Britain!* &c. "Can you deny that you made such a disclosure to President Jefferson? Dare you deny it? The proofs which have been given to the public by Gov. Giles, under the sanction of his name, the allusion in his speeches at the time, the recent letter of Mr. Jefferson disclosing a knowledge of the same fact, the speech of Mr. Randolph in the Senate three years ago [*the report of which was suppressed,*] the silence of your federal friends in that body when they were compelled to listen to the vindication of the integrity of their party from a veteran republican, the inflexible enemy of your father and yourself, your own silence, and the silence of your official editors, who scream in the agony of their peevishness and anger when charges of a character far less infamous than this are hinted in the opposition papers, would produce an irresistible conviction in any unprejudiced mind that you did make that disclosure. You cannot [in a case like this] hide behind the throne and plea l your privilege. You have accused your fellow citizens of plotting treason! That you made such an accusation, is asserted by the Governor of a State, a veteran statesman whose name is known as far as yours, and who has been before the public in high office for forty years, and who speaks from personal knowledge.

"Admit the disclosure to have been true, it would have come with a better grace from any other person in the United States than from you. You was the political friend of the men whom you accused. They were your patrons. They had given you the bread which you had eaten. Their "houses, tables, fortunes, all were yours." As to you, they had committed no offence. There had not been the least intermission of friendly intercourse between you. They had abandoned their best and ablest men to give their offices to you. Your knowledge of their treasonable intentions implies an intercourse of the most confidential kind. Men do not go into the streets to proclaim the treasons which they intend to commit. The fact could not have come to your knowledge, unless from a communication of the most secret and sacred character. The office which gave to your disclosure its consequence and its credit, had been given to you by them. It was the revelation of a Senator of the United States to the President of the United States. When Governor Giles pressed you to the disclosure, you were in great distress. Your face wore its gloomiest aspect. You was doubtful as to your duty, but yet your bosom could find no place for mercy. You loved your country so well that you could not spare your friends! The sacrifice was great, but patriotism required it!

"The secrecy which attended this mysterious disclosure, belies its truth. Your charges against the federal party were not of a vague and general character. Your information [it would seem] was particular. The names of those who were concerned, the names of the foreign agents with whom this treasonable intercourse was holden, were submitted to the President. Your facts were carefully arranged, with far more attention to accuracy and probability than those which your great prototype, Dr. Oates, submitted to the ministers of Charles II. His infamous crudities filled England with dismay, and stained her land with the blood of innocence; but here there was no investigation of this alarming and dangerous conspiracy. Mr. Jefferson was possessed of the names of the New England conspirators. No message was sent to Congress. No judicial investigation was ordered. The public papers (which are seldom backward on such occasions) never brought forth the name of a single individual in connection with this plot.

"Did Mr. Jefferson doubt the truth of your disclosure? Was secresy imposed on him? Was he restrained by his promise of honor? Did you stipulate for the safety and concealment of those whom you accused? Did your dark policy suggest to your mind the expediency of infusing the suspicion into the mind of the President, and yet staying the avenging arm of the government? The disclosure would prove your devotion to your country. Your stipulation for favor would be attributed to a feeling both honorable and amiable. In this way you might propitiate the favor of the administration, secure their confidence, and conceal the falsehood of the accusation. The conception was worthy of Machiavel. Yet Mr. Jefferson was wary—he never trusted you. He received your information—he listened to your disclosures—*yet he never trusted you.*

Amongst the federalists who were before the public in those days, the person who was the most open to suspicion of treasonable designs, was your friend and kinsman, (the worthy representative of an illustrious father, as you now say,) the honorable Josiah Quincy now Mayor of the city of Boston. The violence which characterized the deportment of this gentleman in Congress, the style of his attacks on Mr. Jefferson, so obnoxious to your friend and premier Mr. Clay as to draw from him the memorable expression "that he soiled the carpet on which he trod"—his unsupported motion to impeach him—his bold denunciation of the Louisiana treaty—his extraordinary doctrines at the time of the admission of that country into the Union—his assertion on the floor of Congress that its admission would "justify a revolution"—his bold avowal, in the same place, of a deliberate opinion, that the passing of the bill which provided for its admission would be a virtual dissolution of the Union, that it would free the States from all constitutional allegiance to the general government, "*and that it would be the right of all, and the duty of some to prepare definitely for a SEPARATION, amicably if they could, forcibly if they must:*" his incessant warnings against the Tramontane, western influence—and the mem-

orable resolution which he submitted to the Senate of Massachusetts, that it was unbecoming a moral and religious people to rejoice at our national victories,—are all circumstances which would render him more liable than any other federalist in the United States to the imputation of designs of the character of those which you communicated to Mr. Jefferson. Had Josiah Quincy plotted in dark cabal the dismemberment and degradation of his country, with a conscience as sensitive as yours, a patriotism which sternly cut asunder all the ties which bind man to man, the ties of gratitude and friendship, as iron-hearted as that of the elder Brutus, you would have shrunk from the fellowship of a traitor. But your good understanding with this cherished relation was never suspended: there was not even a momentary coolness between you. The very doctrines which he put forth with such astonishing boldness in Congress, were derived from you, and were sanctioned by your opinions. You have lately taken public occasion to express your admiration of his exalted worth, before the people of Boston. No one believes—no one dares to hint, that Josiah Quincy was ever engaged in any such transactions as you have charged upon the federal party. And is he any less guilty now than he was in 1807?

"The federal party have a right to demand a full disclosure from you. They have a right to the *names*. Even if this tale is true, it is due to justice, it is due to your country to separate the innocent from the guilty, and not to suffer a suspicion of treason to rest upon all the individuals of a great and respectable party.—Come forth, thou coiner of falsehood! Anticipate Gov. Giles. Give us the *names*. Abandon your cowardly reserve, your treacherous secrecy. Come forth with the facts, give them the sanction of your name. Proclaim the traitors! I, a federalist, dare you to the disclosure. I tender you the issue with the whole American people for a jury. I dare you to the trial. If you leave your covert, I will strip you bare. I will show you as you are, a vile informer, a false informer. Titus Oates had the horrible excuse of an ungratified revenge: the Jesuits had expelled him from St. Omer's. You had nothing to revenge. We imputed injustice, and wrong, and uncharitableness to Mr. Jefferson, and yet, was he censurable for believing the solemn asseverations of the most trusted chief of our party? If he did believe them, we have little to forgive, and much to admire. He requires no forgiveness for believing one whom we all believed; and if he did believe him, we have to admire him for his forbearance.

"But you, *you*, ought to be holden in detestation by every man who bears the name of federalist. After your family had led the federalists into all those measures which produced their downfall, after they had ministered to your ambition by bestowing on you their last gift, after you had infused into them a spirit which hurried them along in a course of opposition, now acknowledged to have been too violent—was it for *you* to slander their good name? Was there no tongue but your's to calumniate them? One would have thought that an association of thirty years, distinguished on their part by unvarying kindness and respect, would have saved them from your slanders, if it did not from your reproaches. It was in the wane of our fortunes, when our power had departed, that you sought this interview with Mr. Jefferson, to whom, you had not spoken for years, to whom, attached as you are to the punctilios of etiquette, you had never tendered the official civilities of a senator to the chief magistrate, but had brooded in sullen despondency over the political misfortunes of your family, cherishing at the bottom of your heart a deep and inveterate hatred to all who had been instrumental in effecting their overthrow, and avoiding even the common social intercourse which exists in societies ever so discordant: then it was, that you might have been seen gliding in the obscurity of the twilight along the Pennsylvania avenue, purposely shunning the light—your bosom tortured with unholy ambition—yet feeling, perhaps, some natural pangs, the forerunners of that remorse which must follow the commission of a dishonorable act—premeditating the deed, and conniving the falsehood—stealing warily and cautiously into the palace, and finding yourself in the presence of the hated rival of your father—the man who had eclipsed his grandeur, and had driven him into retirement, the foul slander was whispered in the dark, and ere the nocturnal lamps were lighted you had perpetrated this monstrous ingratitude, this suicide of your honor,—and you stood in the moral world like the deadly Upas, shedding blights and poison over God's fairest works!

"Soon did we ascertain the extent of that devouring ambition which sought its objects despite of the obligations of honor, gratitude and truth. Your measures against Senator Smith (if the statement of Mr. Randolph is to be credited) were undoubtedly initiatory to proceedings against Chief Justice Marshall by impeachment. Yes, to establish yourself in the confidence of the ruling party, you were willing to disgrace and dishonor this ancient and distinguished friend of your father, the colossus of his administration, by a legislative impeachment: and yet he, too,—John Marshall, the chief of the federalists, he too, adheres to you—he too, comes forth, to tell the public that he will now exercise a right, to aid your election which he had abandoned for thirty years! His ancient loyalty is rekindled,—your insults and your injuries have faded from his memory, and he is now ready to exclaim, like Lord Crawford when King Louis XI. was assailed by the bold Duke of Burgundy, "I have fought for his father, and by St. Andrew, end the matter as he will, I will not fail him at this pinch."

CATULLUS.

From the N. Y. Evening Post.

CATULLUS—No. III.

The reader of the following number of Catullus will find some past events recalled to his recollection, which, for any other purpose than that of exposing flagrant profligacy and a total want of principle, might as well have been suffered to rot in oblivion.

The conduct of JOHN QUINCY ADAMS considered, in his relations, political and moral, towards the FEDERAL PARTY.

The same Address continued.—"I once thought that the people of New England would never

have forgotten your agency in bringing about the memorable embargo; but if they have not forgotten it they certainly have forgiven it. To forgive private injuries is commendable, but to forgive a statesman who ruined the great interests *of the State* which he was delegated to protect, requires a degree of forbearance not enjoined by any principle of charity or religion, an unwise and fatal lenity productive of little good, and dangerous to the interests of the community.

"In narrating your conduct on this question, I shall follow the account of Col. Pickering, and I would premise that when the "last of the Romans" undertakes to state facts from personal knowledge, I would yield to his statement the same degree of credit as I would to the evidence of my own senses:—to those who doubt, I can only say, that his testimony is completely corobrated by other evidence, by public documents, and by your own appeals to the public.

The documents submitted to Congress with the Message of President Jefferson, recommending the embargo, were—

No. 1. A proclamation dated Oct. 16, 1807, by the King of Great Britain, requiring his natural born subjects, seafaring men, to return home.

No. 2. An extract of a letter dated Sept. 18, 1807, from the French Grand Judge, Minister of Justice, to the Imperial Advocate General for the Council of Prizes. It was an answer to some questions which concerned the execution of the Berlin decree.

The Berlin decree was issued by the Emperor Napoleon at Berlin, November 21st, 1806, then in the plentitude of his power, by which the British Islands were declared in a state of blockade, all commerce and correspondence with them prohibited. All trade in English merchandise forbidden; and all merchandise belonging to England or coming from its manufactories and colonies declared lawful prize.

The extract from the letter consisted in a question and answer.

1st. May vessels of war, by virtue of the imperial decree of the 21st November last, seize, on board neutral vessels, either English property, or even all merchandise proceeding from the English manufactories or territory.

Answer. His Majesty has intimated, that as he did not think proper to express any exception in his decree, there is no ground for making any in its execution, in relation to any whomsoever.

2. His Majesty has postponed a decision on the question, whether armed French vessels ought to capture neutral vessels bound to or from England, even when they have no English merchandise on board."

(Signed) REGNIER.

"Col. Pickering says these two papers, or the substance of them, had been made public for some time previous to the message, but had "excited but little if any concern amongst those most interested—our merchants and seafaring people: they saw in the proclamation, not an increased, but a diminished danger of impressments; and French cruisers on the seas were then few in number."

"The third paper was a letter, dated Sept. 24, 1807, from General Armstrong to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Champagny; asking him whether the report he had just heard was true—"that a new and extended construction, highly injurious to the commerce of the United States, was about to be given to the imperial decree of the 21st November, 1806."—[Berlin decree.]

"The fourth document was Champagny's answer to Armstrong, bearing date October 7, 1807, substantially like that of Regnier. The imperial minister concludes his letter in these words: "the decree of blockade has now been issued eleven months. The principal powers of Europe, (meaning Holland, Spain, and the other powers which the arms of France had subjected to her control,) far from protesting against its provisions, have adopted them. They have perceived that its execution must be *complete to render it effectual.*"

"The commerce of the United States surpassed that of all the other neutral nations; and with the British dominions was very extensive, and of vast importance to both. To render the blockade of the British Islands complete, the commerce of neutrals with them must cease. This object, in respect to the United States, could be accomplished only by an embargo."

"Such were the grounds, or pretext for the embargo. The President's Message, and the four papers accompanying it, were referred to a committee, of which John Q. Adams was one. In a short time they reported the bill for laying an embargo. It was read once.—A motion made to read it, immediately, a second time, was objected to; it was repugnant to a standing rule of the Senate, wisely formed to prevent hasty decisions." The rule was suspended. "The bill was then read a second time as in Committee of the Whole, and reported to the House without amendment. Then the bill, having been quickly engrossed, was read a third time, and passed."

"The time occupied in this business, from the reception of the President's Message, to the passing of the bill was about four hours. It was Friday. A motion was made to postpone the further consideration of the bill until the next Monday: It passed in the negative. On motion of Mr. Crawford—that the bill be postponed till the next day, it passed in the negative, yeas 12—nays 16. Mr. Adams was amongst the nays. *No member of the Senate displayed equal zeal for the passing of the bill.* In opposing a postponement, to obtain further information, and to consider a measure of such moment, of such universal concern, Mr. Adams made this memorable declaration: "*The President has recommended this measure on his high responsibility: I would not consider—I would not deliberate:—I would act. Doubtless the President possesses such further information as will justify the measure.*" This sentiment (continues Col. Pickering) was so extraordinary, that I instantly wrote it down. *It shocked even Mr. Jefferson's devoted partisans.* "However I may vote (a member was heard to remark) that is too much for me to say." For my own part, I originally viewed, and I still view, the sentiment as so abhorrent to the principles of a free government, so derogatory to the character of a member of Congress, such a dereliction of duty, and so disgraceful to a man of sense, that I am incapable of conceiving of any counter-

balance in official honors and emoluments. An embassy, a judgeship, or the Presidency, to an honorable and independent mind, would, in the comparison, be "as a drop in the bucket, and the small dust in the balance."

"The sentiment expressed by Mr. Adams resolves the whole business of legislation into the will of the Executive."

Again—"In the year 1807, the registered tonnage of the United States employed in foreign trade, amounted to 848,306 tons: of this Massachusetts owned 310, 309 tons.

"In his letter to Mr. Otis, Mr. J. Q. Adams intimates a reproach to me for spending my time, when a senator, in writing the letter to Gov. Sullivan, while he was assiduously devoted to his senatorial duties. But where was his regard to his duty as a legislator for the Union, in advocating and voting for a law which paralyzed all the business of the nation, when by his own admission, it had only four ciphers for its basis? Where was his attention to the rights and interests of his constituents in Massachusetts, when his utmost exertions were made to impose the law on them?"

Again—"whether J. Q. Adams really performed his duty in thus advocating and voting for the embargo, or abandoned it, whether he guarded the interests of his constituents of Massachusetts, or betrayed them, the reader can now form a pretty correct opinion, but if he will accompany me as I proceed, he will see the latter completely established."

"Col. Pickering then adverts to the letter written by you to the Hon. Harrison Gray Otis in justification of the embargo. He says—"In this letter Mr. Adams took new ground on which to rest the embargo; the British orders in council of the 11th Nov. 1807, issued to retaliate the French Emperor's Berlin decree."

Again—"these were the orders which J. Q. Adams has said "stood in front of the real causes of the embargo. To argue (said he) upon the subject of our disputes with Great Britain, *or upon the motives for the embargo, and keep them out of sight*, is like laying your finger over the *unit* before a series of *naughts*, and then arithmetically proving that they all amount to nothing." "Now, (says Col. Pickering,) I will show, that when the embargo was recommended, and when the bill passed the Senate, those orders in council were, in fact, out of sight of the President, out of sight of the Secretary of State, out of sight of the Senate, and out of sight of Mr. Adams himself." He then proves that your bold assertion that the orders in council was a cause of the embargo, was untrue.

1st. By showing that Mr. Jefferson's message recommending the embargo contained no allusion to the orders in council, and that he rested his reasons on the contents of the four papers already mentioned: "and, says he) there is not the slightest reason to believe that he thought of their existence. On the contrary, forty-six days afterwards, viz: in his message to Congress of February 2, 1808, laying before them the orders in council, he says, "I transmit them to Congress as *a further proof* of the increasing dangers to our navigation and commerce, which led to the provident measure of the act of the present session, laying an embargo on our own vessels."

2d. Mr. Madison, in his letter of December 23, 1807, the day after the embargo law was enacted, to William Pinkney, our Minister in London, says: "I enclose you a copy of a message from the President to Congress, and their act in pursuance of it, laying an immediate embargo on our vessels and exports. *The policy and causes of the measure are explained in the message itself.*"

3d. (Col. Pickering continues) "I have said that as to J. Q. Adams himself the orders in council were out of sight, when he zealously advocated and voted for the embargo. This is a plain inference from the facts I have already stated. When hard pressed for adequate causes for the embargo, and not finding them in the four documents communicated with the message, Mr. Adams, it will be recollected, had recourse to the Presidency's highly responsible recommendation of the measure, and the possible information locked up in his bosom, to justify the passage of the law. Now if the orders in council furnished the great and prominent cause for the embargo, and if, compared with them, the four papers assigned by the President as the only causes for an embargo were but four "naughts," is it possible that "those all devouring instruments of rapine," as Mr. Adams calls the orders in council, should never have arisen in their terrific forms to his view? That he should not have so presented them to the view of the Senate? And that they should not have caused him to pour forth a deluge of his appalling metaphors, in describing them? I hesitate not to pronounce it impossible. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Should he assert the contrary, no man of common understanding can believe him. At all events it is clear, from the President's first message and documents, and from the quotations already made from his next message, and from Mr. Madison's letter, that neither Mr. Jefferson nor he had the orders in council in their minds, when assigning and mentioning the causes of the embargo."

4th. "It is equally clear, that no other Senator in voting for the embargo, contemplated the orders in council, because no one adverted to them in the discussion."

Such is the lucid statement of Col. Pickering respecting your conduct and agency in imposition of the embargo.

What reflections does this narrative occasion!

A Senator of Massachusetts refuses to allow the deliberation of a single night to a measure which annihilated the whole shipping interest of the United States, (and of which the State which he represented in the Senate owned more than a third!) A Senator of Massachusetts imposes on his own constituents a wider destruction than the Boston Port-bill! And why did he do it? The President recommended it.—That and that only induced him to support it. Well might the republican Senators be shocked at this monstrous abasement of the legislative character. Well might Col. Pickering say that no office, not the Presidency itself, would be any compensation for such slavish subserviency.

"Odious as your conduct was in this memorable transaction, it would admit of excuse if we could believe that you acted from a high but mistaken sense of duty: but you cannot plead this

honorable fairness of a gentleman—a gentleman cannot quibble, evade, or prevaricate. Truth is as much a habitude with him as decency. In your letter to Mr. Otis, you assert that the British orders in council was the principal cause of your vote for the embargo. The statement of Col. Pickering is demonstration. The orders in council could not have been the cause, because no one in America knew of their existence at the time of the passage of the act! Some men (it is true) might have forgotten the facts, and so confounded the reasons. The transaction at the time of the date of your letter was too recent—your memory is too tenacious, and too accurate to admit the possibility of forgetfulness on this subject. You did not forget. You forget nothing but the obligations of gratitude and fidelity.

"It may suit your purposes to represent these as the opinions of some odd, eccentric, discontented or unprincipled Federalist, which are repudiated by the good sense and true patriotism of the party generally. To show that it is not so, I will produce a few witnesses out of a multitude, and I will take them from "your own New-England."

1st. The late Mr. Dexter, whom you always professed to hold in high respect.

2. Your favorite and cherished friend and kinsman, Josiah Quincy.

3. Tristam Burgess, your champion in the National House of Representatives.

4. Daniel Webster, your Ajax in the Senate.

5. The Legislature of your native State of Massachusetts, the stronghold of your power and influence

6. The City of Boston, now so devoted to your interests.

Speaking of the Restrictive System Mr. Dexter says: "That he believed—

1st. That it overleaps the bounds of constitutional power.

2. That it is impossible to execute it.

3. That the attempt to do so corrupts us, by destroying the correct habits of our merchants, and rendering perjury familiar.

4. That it would be ineffectual to coerce foreign nations, if executed.

5. That it is unjust and oppressive to the commercial part of the community, as it destroys invaluable interests which the government is bound to protect.

6. That it completely sacrifices our only considerable source of revenue, and reduces us to depend on a meagre supply from internal taxation, or to accumulate an enormous public debt by loans procured on hard terms, which government has no adequate funds to reimburse.

7. That it aims a fatal blow at our unexampled progress in wealth and general improvement."

"Such were the strong and conclusive objections of Mr. Dexter to the Restrictive system. The whole Federal party on this question entertained similar sentiments. And after this open avowal in a public address pending a gubernatorial controversy, (and himself a candidate,) the whole republican party supported him. Neither did this avowal lessen him in the estimation of Mr. Madison, under whose administration this Federal gentleman was offered the high office of Minister to Spain, and (it is said) a seat in the cabinet.

"As to Mr. Quincy, he has pronounced this measure in Congress and out of Congress, by night and by day, at all times and in all places, as unconstitutional, unjust and wicked; of a character so oppressive and odious as to justify forcible resistance. The evidence is every where, and it is only to recur to the journals of the day to find it.

Mr. Burges, in a public address applied this language to the Embargo:

"This single measure more impoverished the nation than our eight years war with Britain. It cut off our revenue; discouraged our industry; wasted our capital; ruined our fisheries; exiled our seamen, and scattered them to the four winds of Heaven. Had our government invited to a war of depredation upon us, all the pirates of Barbary, of France, of England, and at the same time let loose the tawny sons of the wilderness on our defenceless frontiers; less, incalculably less, would have been the injury. If the administration had openly taken counsel of France, she would first of all have advised a perpetual Embargo; for that must, by abolishing our government, dissolve our union, destroy our national character, and reduce us back to the tame condition of colonial slavery. Surely there is a singular coincidence between French and American policy. God forbid, that a riband of legionary honor, or a cross of the empire, should solve that dark political riddle—the American Embargo."

"This is the language of the Hon. Daniel Webster, on the floor of Congress: "The faith of this nation is pledged to its commerce, formally and solemnly. I call upon you to redeem that pledge; not by sacrificing while you profess to regard it, but by unshackling it, and protecting it, and fostering it, according to your ability and the reasonable expectations of those who have committed it to the care of government. In the commerce of the country the constitution of the country had its birth. In the extinction of that commerce it will find its grave. I use not the tone of intimidation or menace, but I forewarn you of consequences.—Let it be remembered that in my place, this day, and in the discharge of my public duty, I conjure you to alter your course. I urge to you the language of entreaty. I beseech you by your best hopes of your country's prosperity; by your regard for the preservation of her government, and her union; by your own ambition, as honorable men, of leading hereafter in the councils of a great and growing Empire:—I conjure you by every motive which can be addressed to the mind of man, *that you abandon your system of restrictions; that you abandon it at once—and abandon it for ever.*"

"Mr. Webster fleshed his maiden sword by writing a strong and eloquent pamphlet at that day to prove the Embargo was enacted in the very teeth of the Constitution.

"The Legislature of Massachusetts, in an address to the people, after displaying in the most vivid language the ruinous effects of the Embargo upon the commerce and navigation of the United States, and particularly upon the State of Massachusetts, which navigation in 1805 they represent to have amounted to 1,140,368 tons, of which Massachusetts owned 435,940, in alluding to the South, use these words: "There is not a greater diversity of

interests between them (the people of the South) and yourselves, than will be found in the distant provinces of all great Empires: none, indeed, that a truly national administration cannot reconcile. It is believed too, that many of your Southern brethren accord with you in their estimate of the true interests of their country, and are inclined magnanimously to sacrifice local prejudices to national safety and honor.—*This happy result may be expected, when New England, faithful to her true interests, shall speak with one voice, and exclude from her councils those who, from misapprehension of those interests, or any other cause, are advocates of the present destructive system.*"

"New England does indeed now speak with one voice, but it is to utter the sentence of political condemnation against all those who will not renounce their settled convictions, and yield their venal support to the principal advocate of that destructive System.

"And, again, the same Legislature in a Report, accepted by them, made on the memorials of sundry towns in Massachusetts, concluding with a resolution that the embargo was unconstitutional, and that it violated the rights of the people, say:

"This act is denounced by all the memorialists in the warmest and most energetic language, as a gross and palpable violation of the principles of the constitution; that it cannot be submitted to without a pusillanimous surrender of those rights and liberties, which their ancestors brought to these shores, which they fought and bled to maintain, and which we, their descendants ought to be ready to defend, at the same expense and hazard, or forfeit the character of freemen.

"With such a display of grievances, sufferings and apprehensions before them, couched in terms of affecting eloquence, and breathing a spirit of firmness and resolution to procure, by some means, competent relief, your committee cannot but be forcibly impressed. They believe in the existence of those grievances, and the causes to which they have been ascribed." They further say—"A power to regulate commerce is abused when employed to destroy it, and a manifest and voluntary abuse of power sanctions the right of resistance as much as a direct and palpable usurpation."

"Mr. Quincy has bestowed every epithet of abuse on this measure, which his teeming imagination could supply.

"Mr. Burges pronounced it the most afflictive of all evils—worse than the revolutionary war—worse than a war with France, England, the Barbary powers, and the Indians, united—to be accounted for only from the existence of some deep and wicked plot to change the form of the government.

"Mr. Webster predicted the dissolution of the Union from its continuance, and urged his prophetic warnings upon Congress, in terms almost as solemn and emphatic as those by which that great prophet, whose name he bears announced to the impious and trembling king of the Assyrians the approaching destruction of his empire.

"And yet all these gentlemen are now your chosen friends, your trusted champions, the oracles of your party, the pillars of the throne—without their support your ill-gotten power would be prostrated in a week!

"The Legislature of Massachusetts were no less decided in their opinions as to the injustice and unconstitutionality of the embargo. They appointed fast after fast to deprecate the vengeance of Heaven for the "deep damnation" of this act. They solemnly advised the people to exclude from their councils and confidence "*all the advocates of that destructive system.*" The Legislature of this same State of Massachusetts, in their headlong career of infuriated loyalty, are now ready to visit all those unfortunate citizens with their official vengeance, who venture to doubt whether John Quincy Adams is the greatest of men, the most disinterested of patriots, and the best of Presidents!

"Boston, the city of Boston, who put her newspapers in mourning, and called her proceedings in Faneuil Hall "the second rocking of the cradle of American independence"—who, in town meeting, by an overwhelming majority, resolved, "that they would not voluntarily aid and assist in the execution of the embargo laws, and that all who did ought to be considered as enemies of the constitution of the United States and of the State of Massachusetts, and hostile to the liberties of the people"—now consider all who venture to oppose your re-election as unworthy of all respectable association, and shun them as if their characters had been blasted by the imputation of crime—as if they had been given up to public infamy by the infliction of disgraceful punishment.

"This act, so ruinous to the private interests of the federalists of Massachusetts, (for in commerce and navigation they were at that time deeply interested,) exhausted their patience and forbearance; and, in choosing a Senator to serve after the fourth of March, 1809, they elected Mr. Lloyd, and, kind even in their animosity, they gave you an opportunity to plead persecution, as a claim on the administration. If they did not continue your official honors, they gave you (what was far more important to your interests) the opportunity to represent yourself as a political martyr. You resigned the fragment of your senatorial term, and the federalists, after suffering from the infliction of your anti-commercial legislation, were destined to feel the weight of a pen once so dreadful to the jacobins!" CATULLUS.

From the New-York Evening Post.

CATULLUS.—No. IV.

Those readers who admire to see just and elevated sentiments, ornamented with all the advantages of a beautiful and polished style, are assured, that in the interesting number we now offer them, the writer of Catullus has not flagged a single line in his towering flight.

The conduct of JOHN QUINCY ADAMS considered, in his relations, political and moral, towards the FEDERAL PARTY.

The same Address continued.—"The bright spirit of Fisher Ames had left its mortal part to the darkness of the tomb, and had ascended to its Maker. By a "posthumus attack" on his memory, the federalists were to be wounded, and you assumed the unholy task. You, his professed friend, derided his talents, and denounced his principles. You approached his

grave, and insulted his dust. No ancient reminiscences allayed the vindictiveness of your "posthumous" resentments. Your unsparing malice induced you to represent the eloquent effusions of his matchless pen as the outpourings of infuriated insanity! When that tongue was mute which had influenced a senate and animated a nation—when that hand was cold which had written volumes of political wisdom—you ventured on the ungracious deed, and dared with audacious revilings to insult one when dead, from whom, when living, you would have shrunk as from a thunderbolt—whose indignation would have withered you into nothing, or left you as a blasted monument of the avenging power of genius! But you was safe—no Ames remained—the pang was inflicted on an unhappy widow and grieving orphans. Although floods of tears had fallen on his coffin—although kindred genius had poured forth its elegiac eloquence, and men were proud who had grasped his living hand in friendship—no avenger appeared, and you were left unmolested to the gratification of your miserable revenge on the federalists, by assailing the memory of a man, whom they had honored as a leader when living, and lamented when dead.

"You received your reward, and went through a course of European diplomacy, with outfits and salaries, and the payment for journies actual and journies constructive, and many other contingencies, which fill the purse and lessen the honor. You returned Secretary of State, and was placed in the line of "safe precedents." What federalist experienced your favor or shared your patronage? So no government printing, indeed, was given to Mr. Russell, of the Boston Centinel: but even in that paltry appointment the prevading selfishness of your character was still apparent. Mr. Russell was a trusted and influential personage with the federalists of Massachusetts, and there that party was yet predominant. Without Massachusetts, small indeed was your chance of gaining the Presidency.—But when their ascendancy had terminated, the democratic papers in your interest, to give more effect to their invectives, introduced your opinions. Traitors and tories were the mildest terms in the catalogue of vituperative epithets, which spared not even Mr. Crawford, who was accused of cherishing some liberal feelings towards men who were so unfortunate as to bear the name of federalists, and to be in a minority; and it was proudly proclaimed, in all your papers, that there was none who held the federalists in more scorn and contempt than you.

"But at length the federalists, contemned and despised for so many years, became like the Cossacs to Napoleon, "important from circumstances." The election of President devolved upon the House of Representatives. The votes of four States were in their hands. Massachusetts and Delaware were represented by federalists, and they controlled New-York and Maryland,—they could have neutralized New York,—they could have given to Gen. Jackson the vote of Maryland. Three of these States were to be gained to secure your election. It does not require the discernment of a De Retz or a Richelieu to understand the arts by which you secured the Presidency.

"The administration party have been uncommonly sensitive at the slightest imputation of having gained that election by bargains, secret understandings, or promises of favor. Mr. Clay has made speeches without number, and has written books to prove his innocence of such charges. He has ransacked the United States for witnesses. He has excited the honorable sympathy of Chief Justice Marshall. He has put forth the most solemn declaimers. He has denied the charge so earnestly and so indignantly, that it is apparent that he considers its establishment and verification by incontrovertible proof as the ruin of his reputation, and the destruction of his prospects. If innocent, this effect to clear himself of the imputation is honorable to his character. But can Mr. Adams say that he never endeavored to secure votes by promises of favor? Can he say that on this subject he had no communication with Mr. Webster? If Mr. Clay has exculpated himself, the charge still remains good against Mr. Adams. It was just as censurable in the latter bargain with the federalists to secure personal advantages, as it was to bargain with Mr. Clay. The parties who had knowledge of this transaction have been named in the public papers. Mr. Bailey denies his participation, and well he might; Mr. Webster would never have trusted Bailey in a negotiation of this character. But will Mr. M'Lane and Mr. Hopkinson deny it? Has not Mr. Walsh admitted and justified it? Has Mr. Webster denied it? How stands the fact? After the Representatives of Kentucky, Ohio, Illinois, Missouri and Louisiana (all which States had given their electoral votes against you) had been secured, your success was still doubtful without the federalists. Ten of the thirteen representatives of Massachusetts were federalists, and seven of them at least, uncommitted. Mr. M'Lane represented Delaware, Gen. Van Rensselaer (brother-in-law of the illustrious Hamilton) whose hostility to you was well known, and Mr. Warfield equally hostile, could neutralize and control the votes of New York and Maryland:—both had repeatedly and publicly said that they preferred either of the candidates to you:—you had gained six of the nine Western States, and your prospects were good if you could gain the federalists. In this "pinch of the game" (according to the current report) appeared Mr. Webster. He discerned the crisis, and determined that its importance should not be lost to his friends. He was uncommitted. He had refused to pledge himself to your support, and took the hazard of an election (even in Boston) without commitment, and he had been opposed by the party which required pledges in your favor. This decided and manly course had secured to him a powerful influence over the remnant of the federalists, and it was with no small pride that they beheld a man of the most commanding talents willing to share their humble fortunes, and to wear the badge of a powerless party.

"You commenced a negotiation with Mr. Webster. (I follow the uncontradicted assertion of the public papers.) You commenced a negotiation with Mr. Webster. He knew his man. He trusted nothing to words; and although he received the strongest assurances from you, that if you were the President, the proscription should be removed from the Federal party, and that qualifications and moral worth would be the only test with you, and that party

ranks should no longer be an objection to competent men,—yet, he preferred a written voucher to a treacherous memory. He embodied your assurances in a letter to a party friend, intending, doubtless, that the pledge should remain with the person. He submitted the letter to your inspection. He foresaw that if a misunderstanding should arise as to the terms, the evidence could be produced. If you denied the fact, you would put your veracity in competition with his, and in that trial as to the weight of credibility, he well knew the advantage of a good character. But you saved him from this contingency. In your eagerness to secure the aid, you gave with your own pen a more decided character to the "words of the promise."

"With this "written pledge" thus sanctioned by yourself, the deep-rooted prejudices of the Federalists were overcome:—their wounded feelings were soothed:—their firm determinations were abandoned, and their open declarations falsified; and although the high-souled listened not to the voice of the tempter, yet the deep-rooted prejudices of Gen. Van Rensselaer and Mr. Warfield were removed, their stern hostility was molified; in an unfortunate moment they yielded to a delusion, and were found in a Every which they had scorned.

"You who had practised every art to gain the electoral votes, whose papers had been filled with *pledges* of your scorn and hatred of the federalists, you could seek their support, when necessary, by counter *pledges!* You who have won your way to the chair by "doubling on your track," and with a temper vindictive even to the dead, (for this object) associate yourself on terms of apparent friendship with your most deadly living enemy, and so far soften the sullen obstinacy of your nature as to become the pliant instrument of your most hated rival—you who have "moved heaven and earth to carry your point," and gain the presidency, had then the bold hypocrisy to declare to the representatives of the American people, that if "your refusal" to accept that office would "give an immediate opportunity to the people to form and express, with a nearer approach to unanimity, the object of their preference," you "would not hesitate to *decline* the acceptance of that eminent charge, and submit the decision of that momentous question again to their determination." How forcibly does this bring to recollection an observation of Whitaker in his masterly Vindication of Mary—"An habitual hypocrisy frequently betrays itself, by exercising its powers where they are totally unnecessary, by a wanton display of its deceptions, and by an impertinent affectation of scrupulosity?" Never was observation more applicable.

Your inaugural speech contained the proclamation of amnesty. You told the federal party—you told the world "there still remained one effort of magnanimity, one sacrifice of prejudice and passion, to be made by individuals throughout the nation, who have heretofore followed the standards of political party—that of discarding every remnant of rancor against each other; of embracing as countrymen and friends, and of yielding to talents and virtue alone, that confidence which, in times of contention for principle, was bestowed only upon those who bore the badge of party communion."

"This declaration thus solemnly made in the presence of an assembled nation, revived the hopes of the desponding Federalists, and glimpses of light began to break in on the darkness of their prospects. They embraced your cause with zeal, and were once more rallied under the banner of an Adams.

"You selected your cabinet. No Federalist was invited to aid in your councils—some surprise was manifested: many had supposed that the distinguished character who had rendered such important services, and to whom you owed the presidency, would have been called to a seat in your cabinet, for he certainly was competent to the duties of any office; but as he did not complain, his party were silent. Soon after the mission to St. James' was offered to the late Gov. Clinton: he declined. The same appointment was offered to Mr. Rufus King, which he accepted. Mr. Sergeant was sent to Panama, and no other appointments to offices of any importance have been made of any to whom Federalism could with any colorable pretence be imputed. A very clever political manager sometimes overreaches himself. Should the Federalists require the fulfilment of the pledge, and complain of neglect, your answer was ready. I have offered to Gov. Clinton the appointment to an office of the first importance: this is conclusive evidence of my regard to the claims of your party. This honorable notice of a man who has been your candidate for the office of Governor of New York—who has received your unanimous support when a candidate for the President's office—cannot fail of being satisfactory to you. Gov. Clinton's refusal gave me the opportunity of appointing Mr. King to the same office. This gentleman has been your candidate for the office of Governor of the State of New York against Vice-President Tompkins. The Federalists of Philadelphia by repeated elections have manifested their confidence in the talents and integrity of Mr. Sergeant." CATULLUS.

From the New-York Evening Post.

CATULLUS.—No. V.

The conduct of JOHN QUINCY ADAMS considered, in his relations, political and moral, towards the FEDERAL PARTY.

Same address concluded.—"If some veteran republican had addressed you in the language of complaint and remonstrance, and had pressed his inquiries and remarks in a style like this—"You profess to be a member of the republican party, and friendly to our usages. How could you violate your party obligations, and depart from those usages, by offering high offices to Governor Clinton, Mr. King, and Mr. Sergeant? Mr. King may be respected by his friends—he must be obnoxious to us. Can you suppose that we would tolerate the man who reported to a federal meeting, shortly after the commencement of the last war, resolutions in substance like these?—'We are irresistibly drawn to the conclusion that the American people will, under the name and form of an alliance, be submitted to the will and power of the French Emperor. In this view of the subject, the question of peace or war involves all that is dear and valuable to man on this side the grave. We are therefore under the dire necessity of declaring that we have no con-

fidence in the men who have brought us to this perilous condition.' And again:—'Resolved, that representatives be chosen in the several counties, discreet men, friends of peace. These representatives can correspond or confer with each other, and *co operate with the friends of peace in our sister States*, in devising and pursuing such constitutional measures as may secure our independence and preserve our Union, both of which are endangered by the present war.'"

Your answer to the complaining and dissatisfied republicans may be imagined.

"I profess to be governed by the usages of the Republican party, and I am not conscious of departing from them. I have appointed no Federalist to office. I have extended the patronage of the government only to those of the true faith. Gov. Clinton was a Republican by birth and education—he was never even called a Federalist. He has differed in some of his opinions from some of the Republicans. What then? Have not I, the Chief of the Republican party, differed from that distinguished leader of the Western Republicans, Mr. Clay? It was only a temporary difference:—It has been easily and happily reconciled. I mean to harmonize the Republican party, and to effect an union as firm, sincere and invincible as that which existed in 1801, when we prostrated the aristocracy and terminated the reign of terror. I mean to restore the glorious days of Jefferson. Can it be supposed that I have been heedless of my father's precepts? You know with what zeal he labored to prostrate that monstrous system which was sustained by alien and sedition laws. —In that glorious undertaking Gov. Clinton was a fellow laborer, and you might as well undertake to impeach the republican principle of my father or myself, as of De Witt Clinton.

"Mr. King has been chosen almost unanimously by the Republicans of New York a Senator of the United States: his patriotism has been proved by the very honorable certificate of Vice President Tompkins: his sons have given irrefragable proofs of their complete devotion to the republican party, and have so far thrown off their early aristocratic notions as even to assume the name of "people's men" and to discard the proud *sobriquet* of "pinks of chivalry." The father was particularly patronized by Mr. Van Buren and received from him lessons in political science and republican policy. Can you doubt his republicanism when you examine his conduct relative to the appointment of deputy Post-master at Albany? Solomon Van Rensselaer had some claims on popular gratitude,—his blood had often flowed in his country's battles. —but he was a federalist. It was on this occasion that the republican principles of Mr. King were displayed in a far more striking manner than those of Mr. Van Buren. The latter was neither the political nor personal friend of Sol. Van Rensselaer, and had incurred no obligations either for acts of friendship or political support —Sol. Van Rensselaer had been the zealous political friend of Mr. King, but the latter faithful to the republican party, abandoned his friend! Can you have a stronger proof of devotion than this? There were other advantages secured to the republican party by this appointment:—Mr. John A. King lately a republican assembly-man of the State of N. York, a grave, wise, deep-read and eloquent civilian, condescended to act in the humble capacity of Secretary to his father, with the outfit of a *Charge* only!"

"It is impossible to suppose that the son of "Jonathan Dickinson Sergeant, who put himself at the head of the republicans" in '98, (the republicans who in the slanderous nomenclature of the Federalism of that day were styled a "mob,") could ever have been a Federalist. He scorns their name and association. Although at the late election in Philadelphia he received four-fifths of his votes from them, and the election was in their hands, yet, with that stern independence for which he is so much distinguished, he contented himself with the solid advantage of their votes, and nobly refused their tendered nomination, which he graciously and gratefully accepted from Capt. Jones, John Binns, and Markley!"

"After making these appointments you became frightened even at the gentle murmuring of the republican papers. You stopped at once. You withdrew your offered hand from the Federalists. The stream of your bounty again chilled into ice. You threw them off.—The pledge was violated. The Federalists, without realizing a solitary favor, were again left to cherish hope, and experience disappointment; and to prove the sincerity of your democracy to the Pennsylvanians, Albert Gallatin was sent to the court of St. James'! Vain are the hopes of the Federalists. Mr. Warfield will never surmount the Andes. Mr. Webster will never visit England as your plenipotentiary. You dare not appoint him. You wait a re-election. He may have occasion to call up his recollections of Shakspeare—

> "There is a tide in the affairs of men,
> Which, taken at its flood, leads on to fortune:
> Neglected, all is lost."

When you was put to the test—when the real Federalists were recommended for judicial offices in which party character is not generally so much regarded—when Richard Stockton, (acknowledged by all to have been the first jurist in New Jersey,) was a candidate for the office of District Judge in that State and received the undivided support of the Federalists, and no one ventured to deny his eminent qualifications, he was rejected, because his character as a Federalist was unequivocal, and the office was given to the Saddler. When the same office became vacant in the north district of New York, were the Federalists consulted as to the appointment of a successor? Was not the recommendation of Gov. Clinton of itself sufficient to secure the appointment of Mr. Conklin? The duty again devolved upon you to supply another vacancy in this State. But a few months had intervened since the appointment of Mr. Conklin, and yet the interest of Gov. Clinton was gone. The seven republican representatives in Congress from this State, once contemned and despised as Bucktails, were considered the real representatives of the great republican party—their recommendations had been unnoticed and neglected—they were suddenly invited, courted and coaxed to recommend a new judge. After experiencing one winter of slight & neglect, they were remunerated by another of flattery and caresses, and the Federalists and Clintonians experienced a vicissitude in court favor, and found themselves in a new

position! An election had intervened, and the Bucktail or Republican party had gained both branches of the State Legislature, the Lieutenant Governor, and a majority in the national House of Representatives. This change in the "great State" produced a corresponding change in feelings and opinions at Washington. The Republican members declined to recommend a judge. The claim of Chancellor Kent was supported by the Clintonians and Federalists with great zeal and earnestness. The republicans admitted that the Chancellor was possessed of the highest qualifications, that he was competent to the duties of any judicial office, that his integrity was incorruptible, and his character without stain or blemish; but so great was the new-born attachment to the Bucktails, that the high claims of this eminent and illustrious lawyer were disregarded, and the office was bestowed on Mr. Betts, much his junior in years and abilities. In this vacillating courtship of the parties which have alternately predominated in this State, you have disregarded and neglected the highest interest of the nation, and have rejected jurists universally acknowledged to possess the most eminent qualifications to secure objects personal and selfish.

To what a miserable situation have the once proud federalists degraded themselves? The federalists, without whose aid you never could have reached the Presidency, without whose aid you cannot be sustained, are the Helots of your party. One would think that your own interests, to which you are always sensitive, would induce you to treat them with more consideration. Without them, you could not even show the fragment of a party, and yet you have not the spirit to acknowledge the existing connexion, although every one perceives it. Devoted to you (with few exceptions) having amongst them men of the first grade of talent, of the finest genius, of the highest capacity to serve the nation in great affairs, they, like the Jews in Egypt, have no consolation but in the hope of the promised land. They feel the neglect. They hate and scorn while they serve you. In secret corners amongst themselves the outpourings of their hearts discover their burning sense of the shame of their degradation.

"Oh it sickens the heart" to see this lofty party, who opposed and defied for more than twenty years the most powerful and popular Presidents; whose aspirations were of no humble character; whose proud boast was that in their ranks were embodied the wealth, talent and chivalry of the nation; who compromised no principles, insensible alike to persuasion, flattery and ambition; who, like the fire-worshippers of Persia, continued to cherish the sacred flame, and worshipped as their fathers had worshipped. Yes,—it does sicken the heart now to see them cowering to the craven, and trusting the apostate! It does sicken the heart to see them bending in lowly reverence before a dishonored man; satisfied to play the mute on the same stage where they once "enacted the parts of heroes;" daily discovering by some new and monstrous association an increasing abasement of character, and a wider departure from honorable pride; finding in the lowest depth of their degradation a deep still lower. Can it be possible that great and renowned men, men of lofty minds and of honorable character can associate themselves with Agg, Bains and the Kickapoo? If the delusion should be dissipated; if they should abandon the apostate and fly from dishonor; if they should rally round some veteran who had served them faithfully and truly, in prosperity and adversity, and give an honorable support to an honorable man, they might pull down the pillars of your ill-constructed temple and bury you in its ruins. Better, far better to hazard their political existence in a righteous effort than to live dishonored.

One would think that the monument which federal gratitude has reared to honor the memory of Hamilton in Trinity Church yard, would fall apart when federalists shall move along Broadway, to swell the train and the triumph of one who imaged him while living, and reviled him when dead. One would think that the shadowy form of Fisher Ames would come forth from the tomb, and if a blush could redden on the pallid cheek of a disembodied spirit, his would give one indignant sign of vitality when he witnessed the throng who now follow your chariot wheels through the streets of Boston, taking your dust, shouting your praises, and revelling in the exuberance of their loyalty; and who once, in the agonized bitterness of their grief, had poured out at his grave the tears of the heart!—And is this the sad condition of human nature? Are the noblest and most generous affections to be suffered for ever to run to waste in senseless and headlong loyalty? The history of the federalists was written long ago. The English Jacobites roused from the slumbers of half a century, to follow the son of the hereditary monarch; those who shared his prison rather than desert him, were spurned from his presence and treated with insult; their councils were betrayed to the Elector of Hanover; their lives were in constant danger from the treachery of the time-servers and apostates, to whom alone he gave his confidence. He overlooked the tried fidelity of those who served him from attachment, and gave the management of his affairs to his enemies. Even his Secretary was the pensioned agent of King George. *He filled his strong boxes with money*, and permitted his most faithful followers to beg!

And is the parallel to be completed? Are the ill-fated federalists doomed to find their safety in their insignificance, and to receive immunity from the contemptuous pity, rather than from the magnanimous admiration of generous enemies? Are they satisfied to *amalgamate* their fortunes with the fortunes of John Quincy Adams, and without any honorable distinction to act as the menials of a selfish apostate, to serve in his ranks without command, not to share the honors and the advantages of the victory, but only the disgrace and disasters of the defeat? Here I take my leave of you.

CATULLUS.

A Damper.—Mr. Solomon Clarke, of Nashville, happening in Lexington a short time since, was introduced to Henry Clay, who accosted him to this effect: "Pray, Mr. Clarke, in case of Gen. Jackson's election, what offices will he confer upon Col. Benton and his friend Tom Moore?" "General Jackson is not in the habit of *making appointments to office before his election!*" returned Clarke.—*Wes. Bal.*

For the United States' Telegraph.

The Jackson Committee of Correspondence of Philadelphia, have placed before the public eye, a series of letters, on nearly all the topics now discussed; and yet, the advocates of the administration have ventured to notice a part only of a single letter. Even if the committee had erred in one particular, it need not excite surprise; but I am about to show, that the National Journal is mistaken, even as to that particular.

The Journal, in language sufficiently gross, I confess, asserts, that Andrew Jackson never was appointed by Washington, Attorney of the District, now Tennessee: that the Philadelphia Committee forged the paper appended to their tenth letter: and insinuates that the whole was done under the guidance of some unseen director!

As to the paper appended in a note to their tenth letter, it is expressly stated to be a form of a commission, the date of which is not thought correct, but that it is believed to be so in all respects. The object of presenting this form is obvious—instead of merely *saying*, "Washington made Jackson an Attorney of the United States," it *shews* in the form, *what* the act was: it shows that Washington expressed confidence in Jackson's *learning* and *integrity*, and from this, the people have a true idea of the thing done. That such was the form, to a letter, of the commissions given to district attornies, I have positive knowledge; so that, if Andrew Jackson was appointed attorney, he must have got a commission exactly in the form given, and no evil is done by laying that form before the public.

The main question then, is—*was Andrew Jackson appointed by Washington?* If he was, I suppose the Journal itself will not complain of the rest.

That Andrew Jackson was appointed attorney of the district, now Tennessee, by Washington, I propose to prove, not only by the strength of affirmative proof, but by the absolute weakness and absurdity, if not falsity of the negative evidence of the Journal. I propose to do this without speaking to a human being, or applying in any way to any person for information—to apply to Gen. Eaton is not possible for early use.

1. In the Life of Gen. Jackson, by John H. Eaton, Esq. it is stated, that Andrew Jackson, in October, 1788, went with Judge McNairy to Nashville—that he established himself as a lawyer in good business there—and that he was "shortly afterwards appointed by Washington 'attorney general for the district, in which 'capacity he continued to act for several 'years."

This testimony, uncontradicted until now, and now only by the Journal, is enough for all reasonable men: but I proceed—

2. In the letter of Judge John McNairy to the Nashville Jackson Committee, dated "Nashville, May 7, 1827," he says—"Gen. Jackson 'and myself have been acquainted more than '40 years, I think 44 or 45 years; part of the 'time we lived together; and the balance in 'the immediate neighborhood of each other. 'We moved together, from North Carolina to 'this State, and arrived in Nashville, in October. 1788."

3. The Journal admits that the district, now Tennessee, was organized for judicial purposes, under act of May 26, 1790: and it admits that John McNairy was appointed United States Judge under that act, on the 9th June, 1790.

4. In the letter from Judge John Overton to the Nashville Jackson Committee, dated May 8, 1827, he states, that having completed the study of the law, he went to settle in he country, now called West Tennessee; and then proceeds—'Mr. A. Jackson had studied 'the law at Salisbury, North Carolina, as I understood, and had arrived in this country with 'Judge McNairy, &c. all lawyers, seeking their 'fortunes, not more than a month or two before 'my arrival.' 'Jackson went down the river 'from Nashville to Natchez, some time in the 'winter or spring of 1791.' 'Previously to his 'starting, he intrusted all his law business to 'me' 'He decended the river, returned from 'Natchez to Nashville, and was at the Superior 'Court at the latter place, in May, 1791, attending to his business as a lawyer, and *Solicitor* '*General for the* Government.'

These facts are therefore evident:

1. That A. Jackson was at Nashville, October, 1788.
2. That the Territory was organized for judicial purposes, after May, 1790.
3. That the Judges, McNairy, &c. were appointed June, 1790.
4. That A. Jackson was the Government Solicitor General, as Judge Overton calls it, in May, 1791.

All this is independent of Major Eaton's positive declaration, in the biography of Gen. Jackson, that Gen. Washington appointed him Attorney, shortly after his establishment at Nashville; and as the Court was not organized until May, 1790, it must have been after that.

In the face of this affirmative proof, the Journal asserts, that Gen. Jackson was not appointed by Washington. Let us see what evidence it gives. It says:

1. May 26, 1790, the President signed "An act for the government of the territory of the United States, south of the river Ohio. *See Laws U. S. Vol.* 2, *p.* 104.
2. The first section of this act ordains, that "the government of the said territory south of the Ohio, shall be similar to that which is now exercised in the territory north-west of the Ohio.
3. The form of government prescribed for the territory north-west of the Ohio, will be found in the ordinance of Congress, of the 13th July, 1787.—*See Laws U. S. Vol.* 1, *p.* 476.
4. The ordinance provides for the appointment by the United States, of a *Governor*, a *Secretary*, a *Court*, to consist of *three Judges*, and (when there should be a certain number of inhabitants in the territory,) of a legislative council, consisting of five members. *It does not authorize the appointment of an Attorney of the United States.*

This, then, is the evidence of the Journal—but the Journal is not content with this—it goes on to assert, that no Attorney was appointed, and how does it prove this? Why, by another assertion of its own, that no officers, but those it names, *Governor, Secretary, Judges* and *Council*, were appointed!

In truth, this is a pitiful figure which the great Journal of the Government cuts—a paltry equivocation—a wretched apology for the pompous display of names and dates!

The position of the Journal is this. Jackson was not appointed, because the ordinance did not enumerate an Attorney amongst the officers to be appointed. Jackson was not appointed, because a Governor, Secretary, and Judges, and Council were appointed.

This is the mighty proof!

The answer to all this is perfectly simple. All must agree, that three Judges, constituting a *Court*, were appointed, for business within United States jurisdiction. Has any body ever heard of a Court of the United States, without an Attorney of the United States? I might as well ask if any body had ever seen a coach travel without horses? The fact is, the organization would have been imperfect without a representative of the Union. Ay, but says the Journal, the ordinance did not authorize an appointment of an Attorney. Indeed! this is marvellous! If the Journal will look at page 71, vol. 2, Laws of the United States, it will find a key, that will open a door to necessary knowledge on this subject. "An act to establish the judicial courts of the United States," section 35, approved September 24, 1789, says: "In all the Courts of the United States, the parties may plead and manage their own causes, personally, or by the assistance of such counsel or attorney at law, as, by the rules of the said Courts respectively, shall be permitted to manage and conduct causes therein. *And there shall be appointed in each district, a meet person, learned in the law, to act as Attorney for the United States in such district, who shall be sworn, &c.*"

Can any thing be plainer? In 1789, a general act was passed, directing attorneys to be appointed in all the Courts United States. In 1790, a Court U. S. was organized in the district, now Tennessee: in the organizing law it was useless to authorize that to be done, which the general judiciary act already directed to be done: so that, unless Washington neglected his duty, an attorney for it was appointed: To suppose that no attorney was appointed, is to suppose as gross a piece of absurdity as stupidity could engender. *Who*, then, was appointed? The Journal has access to all books and papers. I have not: if any body but Andrew Jackson was appointed, let the journal tell us *who* it was, and the matter will be settled: But I aver that Andrew Jackson was appointed, and nobody else—solemn display of knowledge on the point, of the Journal, to the contrary notwithstanding.

AN ENQUIRER.

From the American Sentinel.

THE VOTE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Congressional Districts.

The *First District*, now represented by *Joel B. Sutherland*, is composed of Southwark, Moyamensing, Passyunk, Blockley and Kingsessing, and the *County* of Philadelphia, Cedar, Pine, and New Market wards in the *City* of Philadelphia." In this district, the Jackson electoral ticket will have a majority of at least 800.

The *Second District*, composed of "Locust, Peck, Walnut, Chesnut, High, Middle, South, North Mulberry, South Mulberry, North, Upper Delaware and Lower Delaware Wards, now represented by *John Sergeant*. In this district, Mr. *Hemphill* will be the opposing candidate to Mr. *Sergeant*. Although we put it down as doubtful, Mr. *Hemphill* (the Jackson candidate) *will be elected*.

The *Third District*, now represented by *Daniel H. Miller*, is composed of the Northern Liberties, Kensington, Penn Township, Germantown, Roxborough, Bristol, Oxford, Byberry, Moreland, and Lower Dublin townships. In this district the opposition admit we will have a majority.

The *first* and *third districts* are made up of the *county* of Philadelphia and the three lower wards of the *city*, viz: Pine, Cedar and New Market. In these three wards, last year, the Jackson majority was 58 votes. The remaining part of the two districts, is formed out of the *county* of Philadelphia. There Binns admits, by his estimate, that the Jackson party will receive 1000 majority: Consequently, *he admits*, that the *first and third Congressional districts will go for Jackson.*

The *Fourth District*, now represented by *James Buchanan, Charles Miner, and Samuel Anderson*, composed of "Lancaster, Chester and Delaware counties." Of the present members, Messrs. *Miner* and *Anderson* are for the administration, and Mr. *Buchanan against* it.—For the approaching election, the tickets are so nominated, as to make the election a test of the Presidential election. Messrs. *Anderson*, of Delaware, *Haines* of Chester, and *Heister* of Lancaster, are on the Administration ticket.—Messrs. *Buchanan* of Lancaster, *Evans* of Chester, and *Leiper* of Delaware, are on the Jackson ticket. The Presidential question has not been submitted *before* in this district upon the congressional election. Both parties claim the majority in it. The election will be strongly contested, and the majority on whichever side it may be, will not be great. Our opinion is, that the Jackson party will carry their ticket; in which case, we will gain two Jackson members in the room of Messrs. *Miner* and *Anderson*.

The *Fifth District*, "Montgomery County," now represented by *John B. Sterigere*, friendly to the election of Gen. Jackson. It is said, that he will be nominated again; if so, he will be re-elected by a majority at least of 500 votes, over his opponent *Joseph Royer*, an Adams man.

The *Sixth District*, composed of "Dauphin and Lebanon counties." Here Judge *Green*, the present representative, a Jackson man, will be re-elected.

The *Seventh District*, composed of "the counties of Berks, Schuylkill and Lehigh," at present represented by Messrs. *Adams* and *Frey*, both Jacksonians. The ticket for this district has not yet been agreed upon. No candidate but a friend of Jackson will be nominated. The majority will exceed 4000 at the *electoral election*. Binns' estimate concedes this district to Jackson.

The *Eighth District*, composed of "the counties of Bucks, Northampton, Pike and Wayne," now represented by Samuel D. Ingham and George Wolf. They will be *re-elected* by a very large majority. In this district the Jackson elec-

toral ticket will get a majority of upwards of 3000.

The *Ninth District*, composed of "the counties of Union, Northumberland, Columbia, Luzerne, Susquehanna, Bradford, Lycoming, Tioga, Potter and M'Kean." This district is now represented by Gen. *Samuel M'Kean*, *George Kremer*, and *Espy Vanhorn*. The ticket has not yet been agreed upon, but no person can be chosen in that district, unless he is friendly to the election of the Farmer of Tennessee. The majority at the electoral election will be very great. The central committee estimate it at upwards of 7000. It is worthy of remark, that in this district, the administration party do not talk of *putting an Adams man in the field for Congress*.

The *Tenth District*, composed of "the county of *York*." Dr. *Adam King*, the present Jackson representative, will be *re-elected*. The majority for the Jackson electoral ticket will be large—yet Binns claims for the administration a majority of 300.

The *Eleventh District*, composed of the counties of "Adams, Franklin, Cumberland, and Perry," now represented by *Wm. Ramsey, of Cumberland*, and *James Wilson, of Adams*. Mr. Ramsay is for Jackson, and Mr. Wilson for Adams. In consequence of his going for the administration, Mr. Wilson will be left at home. The ticket has not yet been settled; Mr. Ramsay will be one of the candidates, and will be re-elected. The Jackson electoral ticket will succeed by a majority of 2500.

The *Twelfth District*, composed of the counties of "Huntingdon, Mifflin, Centre, and Clearfield," now represented by *John Mitchell*, a friend of Jackson. Here a Jackson man beyond a doubt will be elected. The Jackson electoral ticket will succeed by a majority of from twenty-four to twenty-seven hundred. In this district no Adams candidate will be nominated for congress. Binns' estimate admits that Jackson will have a majority.

The *Thirteenth District*, composed of the "counties of Bedford, Somerset, and Cambria," represented by *Chauncey Forward*, a Jacksonian. The Jackson electoral ticket here will get upwards of 3000 majority. No opposition by the administration. Binns' estimate gives this district also to Jackson.

The *Fourteenth District*, composed of "the counties of Fayette and Greene," represented by *Andrew Stewart*, an Adams man. Binns says we will get a majority in the district. We ask 2500 majority.

The *Fifteenth District*, composed of "Washington county," now represented by *Jos. Lawrence*, an Adams man. Our majority for the electoral ticket will be about 2000. Binns admits by his estimate that we will get a majority here.

The *Sixteenth District*, composed of the counties of Allegheny, Beaver, Butler, and Armstrong, now represented by *James S. Stevenson* and *Robert Orr*. We claim a majority for the Jackson electoral ticket of 2600. The administration men have only dared to put one Congressional candidate in the field—three out of the four candidates running for Congress being for Jackson.

The *Seventeenth District*, composed of "the counties of Westmoreland, Indiana, and Jefferson,' now represented by *Richard Coulter*, friendly to Jackson; the administration men have not ventured to nominate a candidate in opposition to Mr. Coulter. Our majority for the electoral ticket will be 2500. Binns also concedes this district to Jackson by his calculation.

The *Eighteenth District*, composed of "the counties of Erie, Crawford, Mercer, Warren, and Venango,' now represented by *Stephen Barlow*. We will have a large majority in this district in favor of our electoral ticket.

We have prepared this estimate with great care, that our friends abroad, as well as at home, may learn the real strength of Gen. Jackson in this State.

In many of the congressional districts, it will be perceived, that even Binns, in his estimate of the vote of Pennsylvania, concedes that we will have majorities for Jackson. It will also be perceived, that in many of the districts, no administration candidates are likely to be put in nomination, so overwhelming is the Jackson vote in them.

In concluding this article, we request the administration editors throughout the State, and the Union, if they please, to take notice of this opinion in relation to the approaching congressional election in Pennsylvania. We ask it to be *recorded*, as our opinion, that at the congressional election in October, the administration will not have a probable chance of carrying more than *two districts* in this State, viz. the *second* and *fourth*. In those districts, every inch of ground will be warmly contested; and such is the enthusiasm of the friends of Jackson, that it is confidently believed, by many of the most intelligent of our friends, that even in them our candidates will be elected. For ourselves, we believe, that the chances are, on the whole, in favour of the Jackson candidates. But if we fail, it will be by a very small vote: and the administration will have but *two* districts out of *eighteen*, into which the State is divided.

Contemptible—The New-York National Advocate, gives the names of the members of the legislature of this State, "*opposed* to a repeal of the electoral law." This "list," which embraces all the federal administration members, and just enough of the republican Jackson members to make up a bare majority in both houses, the Advocate pretends "has been compiled out with much care!" This is a very contemptible artifice, quite worthy of its source, and very much in the manner of John Binns and the National Intelligencer. The design is to convey the impression that all the members whose names are not included in the "list," are in favor of a repeal. The National Advocate is challenged to name a single Jackson member of either branch of the legislature who is *not* opposed to a repeal of the electoral law. A good cause can scarcely require the aid of such tricks: And they accelerate the downhill course of a bad cause.—*Albany Argus*.

Stick to your Candidate.—A Jackson and an Adams man met the other day—"Hurra for *Jackson*," said the first. "Hurra for the *Devil*," said the spunky coalitionist—"Very well," retorted the Jacksonian, "you stick to your candidate, and I'll stick to mine."—*Emporium*.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*; subject to newspaper postage, and *no more*.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 4, 1828. No. 30.

GEN. JACKSON AT NEW ORLEANS.

Among the attempts to destroy the character of Gen. Jackson, made by the National Intelligencer, the publication of a letter written to him by the Acting Secretary of War, in the spring of 1815, in reply to complaints from the disaffected at New Orleans, and the suppression of his answer, is not the least remarkable.—That letter speaks of complaints against Gen Jackson's exercise of military power, and at the same time that it expresses the high confidence of the President, (Mr. Madison,) calls upon Gen Jackson to communicate the reasons for his conduct. We say that the Intelligencer has suppressed his answer: because it is not to be believed that Mr. Madison would have retained him in command of the army, or that Mr. Monroe would have conferred additional offices upon Gen. Jackson, if he had refused or neglected to give a satisfactory answer to such a letter. The files of the War Department are open to the Editors of the Intelligencer; they are closed against us. We do not know that any letter from Gen Jackson is on file. But we are bound to presume that the letter of the Secretary of War was *satisfactorily* answered, otherwise it would have been the duty of the President to have ordered the arrest and trial of Gen Jackson. Instead of which, all know that he was a favorite of Mr. Madison's and also of Mr. Monroe's administration.

Mr. Adams himself, long after this, said of him, that he was

"An officer, whose services entitle him to the highest rewards, and whose whole career has been signalized by the purest intentions and the most elevated purposes."

The Editors of the Intelligencer know, that that letter was prepared for the eye of those who had made complaints against Gen. Jackson. One of the most invaluable properties of our form of government is, that, whatever might have been the motives of those opposed to Gen. Jackson, it was as much the duty of the President to examine into charges preferred by the disaffected, as if they had originated in the purest patriotism. And the Editors of the Intelligencer know, that it is usual to furnish the accusers with a copy of such communication to the person accused, in answer to their complaint, and hence it is more than probable, that a copy of Mr. Dallas's letter to Gen. Jackson was transmitted to his accusers. And the fact that it was intended for them as well as for him, will explain the terms in which it was written.

But did Mr. Madison prosecute the subject further? No. Why did he not do so? We are constrained to believe that Gen. Jackson's answer was satisfactory.

We do not know what that answer was; but in the absence of the answer itself, which the Secretary of War refuses to us, although he admits Mr. Gales to examine the [illegible] we have published Gen. Jackson's defence before Judge Hall. We invite for it a deliberate document that perusal which it merits—and place before our readers the following appropriate and able vindication, from the pen of the venerated Jefferson:

Extract of a letter from Mr. Jefferson to John B. Colvin, Esq.

"To proceed to the conspiracy of Burr, and particularly to Gen. Wilkinson's situation in New Orleans. In judging this case we are bound to consider the state of the information, correct and incorrect, which he then possessed. He expected Burr and his band from above, a British fleet from below, and he knew there was a formidable conspiracy within the city—Under these circumstances, was he justifiable, 1st. In seizing notorious conspirators? On this there can be but two opinions: one of the guilty and their accomplices: the other, that of all honest men. 2d. Sending them to the Seat of Government, when the written law gave them a right to trial in the Territory? The danger of their rescue, of continuing the machinations, the tardiness and weakness of the law, apathy of the Judges, active patronage of the whole tribe of lawyers, unknown dispositions of the juries, an hourly expectation of the enemy, salvation of the city, and of the Union itself, which would have been convulsed to its centre, had that conspiracy succeeded, all these constituted a law of necessity and self preservation, and rendered the salus populi supreme over the written law. The officer who is called to act on this superior ground, does indeed risk himself on the justice of the controlling powers of the Constitution, and his station makes it his duty to incur that risk. But those controlling powers, and his fellow citizens generally, are bound to judge according to circumstances under which he acted. They are not to transfer the information of this place, or moment, to the time and place of this action: but to put themselves into his situation. We know here that there never was danger of a British fleet from below, and that Burr's band was crushed before it reached the Mississippi. But Gen Wilkinson's information was very different, and he could act on no other.

"From these examples and principles, you may see what I think on the question proposed. They do not go to the case of persons charged with petty duties, where consequences are trifling: and time allowed for a legal course, nor to authorise them to take such cases out of the written law. In these the example of overleaping the law, is of greater evil than a strict adherence to its imperfect provisions. It is incumbent on those only who accept of great charges, to risk themselves on great occasions, when the safety of the Nation, or some of its very high interests are at stake. An officer is bound to obey orders—yet he would be a bad one who should do it in cases for which they were not intended, and which involved the most important consequences. The lines of discrimination between cases, may be difficult; but the good officer is bound to draw it at his own peril, and throw himself on the justice of his country, and the rectitude of his motives."

From the Louisiana Gazette.

Answer, submitted by Major General Jackson, on a rule, to show cause why an attachment for contempt should not issue against him.

This respondent has received a paper, purporting to be the copy of a rule of the district court of the United States for Louisiana: in a suit entitled "The United States vs. A. Jackson; commanding him to show cause why an attachment should not issue against him, for divers alleged contempts of the said court." Before he makes any answer whatever to the said charges, he deems it necessary to protest, and he does hereby protest against, and reserve to himself all manner of benefit of exception to, the illegal, unconstitutional, and informal nature of the proceedings instituted against him; it appearing by the said proceeding—

I. That witnesses have been summoned by process of subpœna, in a suit or prosecution of the United States against him, when, in fact, in truth there was not then any such suit or prosecution legally pending in said court.

II. That the said rule was obtained at the instance of the Attorney of the United States, for the district of Louisiana, who had no right officially to ask for, or obtain it; the duties of the Attorney being, by law, restricted to the prosecution of "all delinquents for *crimes* and *offences*, cognizable under the authority of the United States, and all civil actions in which they shall be concerned." As this proceeding is not pretended to be a civil action, to bring it within the purview of the duties of the Attorney, it must be a prosecution for a crime or offence, cognizable under the authority of the United States. But the fact stated in the rule do not constitute any "crime or offence, cognizable under this authority." The courts of the United States have no common law jurisdiction of crimes or offences; if therefore, the facts stated in the rule are not made such by statute, they are not cognizable by the courts; but the statutes have been searched, and no such provision can be found: therefore, the facts charged are not offences which are either cognizable by this court, or liable to be prosecuted by the Attorney for the United States.

III. That if this be a prosecution for a *crime* or *offence* under the authority of the United States, the mode of proceeding is both unconstitutional and illegal; the 7th and 8th amendment to the Constitution contain many provisions directly contrary to the mode of proceeding by attachment, for contempt; particularly the 7th amendment, that no person shall be deprived of liberty, or property, without due process of law; and of the 8th, that, in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right of a speedy trial, by an impartial jury; and in the 32d section of the law *for punishing certain crimes against the United States*, is contained a conclusive implication, if not an expressed provision, that no offence can be prosecuted, except by *information* or *indictment*; neither of which have been filed, in this instance. The respondent, therefore, concludes those heads of exceptions, by the dilemma, that, if the proceeding be a prosecution for a *crime* or *offence* cognizable by the authority of the United States, it is both unconstitutional and illegal in its present form; and if it be not such a prosecution, then has the Attorney of the United States no right to institute it; his ministry, by law, extending only to them.

IV. That this court has no right to issue an attachment for any contempt whatever, or to punish the same, in any other cases than those prescribed by the 17th section of the judiciary act, which confines such authority to the punishment, by fine and imprisonment, for contempt in any *cause or hearing before the same*,—whereas, by the rule, nor the affidavits, does it appear, that the alleged contempts were offered in any cause or hearing before the said Distaict Court; on the contrary, all the acts complained of as contempts, are stated to have been done in relation to an ex-parte application made to the judge of the said court, at his chambers, at a time when his court was in vacation, and not in a *cause or hearing before the court*.

V. That no attachment ought to issue; for neglecting or refusing a return to a habeas corpus, issued and returnable out of court; the statutes on that subject, both in England and in the United States, wherever they have been re-enacted, contain express penalties for this offence; doubtless for the reason that such *neglect or refusal*, in relation to an act done, not in a *cause or hearing* pending in court, but in an ex-parte proceeding at a judge's chambers, could not be punished, by attachment, as a contempt.

VI. That no act in relation to the writ of habeas corpus, or the allowance of the same, in the case mentioned in the said rule, can be considered as a contempt; because the judge of this honorable court, by the 14th section of the judiciary act of the United States, is expressly inhibited from issuing any writ of habeas corpus, except in cases of prisoners 'in custody,' under or by color of the authority of the United States, or committed for trial before some court of the same; or who are necessary to be brought into court to testify; neither of which circumstances appear, either in the writ, the allowance of the same, or the affidavit on which it was founded. This court, then, having no jurisdiction of the case, according to a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, this respondent had a right to consider the service as a trespass.

VII. That, by the said writ, no place was designated at which the same should be returned.

VIII. That the writ was served on the respondent, long after the return thereof, by reason whereof he could not have complied with the tenor, had he been so disposed.

IX. The said writ of habeas corpus was issued in an irregular manner, and the respondent was in no wise compelled by law to obey it; inasmuch as the name of the judge, allowing the same, was not *signed* on the writ with his proper hand writing; nor were the words, "according to the form of the statute," marked thereon—both which are positively required, by the statutes regulating the issuing of such process: and without which they need not be obeyed. Should it be objected, that the English statutes are not binding here, it is answered, that the U. States are without a statuary provision on the subject; and that the introduction of the writ of habeas corpus generally, must introduce it, as it stood at the time of making the constitution."

X. That if the allowance on the back of the

affidavit, contrary to the express words of the statute, be deemed sufficient, yet the respondent was not bound to pay any attention to the writ of habeas corpus, because the same was not issued in conformity with the allowance given on the fifth day of March; this was for a writ returnable on the next day, and afterwards altered, so as to bear date on the sixth of the same month, returnable on the succeeding morning, which would have been the 7th; whereas the writ actually issued, bore date the 6th, and was returnable the same day—thus varying materially from the allowance. This circumstance is an excellent illustration of the wisdom of the statuary provision, which requires that the writ itself be signed by the judge.

Under all which protestations and exceptions —without submitting to the jurisdiction of the said court, or acknowledging the regularity of the proceedings, but expressly denying the same. This respondent, in order to give a fair and true exposition of his conduct, on every occasion in which it may be drawn into question—

Saith—

That previously to, and soon after, his arrival in this section of the seventh military district, he received several letters and communications, putting him on his guard against a portion of the inhabitants of the State, the Legislature, and foreign emissaries in the city. The population of the country was represented as divided by political parties and national prejudices; a great portion of them attached to foreign powers and disaffected to the government of their own country, and some as totally unworthy of confidence. The militia was described as resisting the authority of their Commander-in chief, and encouraged in their disobedience by the Legislature of the State: that Legislature characterized as politically rotten; and the whole State in such a situation as to make it necessary to look for defence principally from the regular troops, and the militia from other States. Among those representations, the most important, from the official station of the writer, were those of the Governor. On the 8th of August, 1814, he says—

"On a late occasion I had the mortification to acknowledge my inability to meet a requisition from Gen. Flournoy; the corps of this city having, for the most part, resisted my orders, being encouraged in their disobedience by the Legislature of the State, then in session; one branch of which, the Senate, having declared the *requisition* illegal and oppressive, and the House of Representatives having rejected a proposition to approve the measure. How far I shall be supported in my late orders, remains yet to be proved. I have reason to calculate upon the patriotism of the interior and Western counties. I know also that there are many faithful citizens in New Orleans; but there are others, in whose attachment to the U. States, *I ought not to confide*. Upon the whole, Sir, I cannot disguise the fact, that if Louisiana should be attacked, we must principally depend for security upon the prompt movements of the regular force under your command, and the militia of the Western States and territories. At this moment, we are in a very unprepared and defenceless condition: several important points of defence remain unoccupied, and in case of a sudden attack, this capital would, I fear, fall an easy sacrifice."

On the 12th of the same month, the respondent was told—

"On the native Americans, and a vast majority of the Creoles of the country, I place much confidence, nor do I doubt the fidelity of many Europeans, who have long resided in the country; but there are others, much devoted to the interest of Spain, and whose partiality to the English is not less observable than their dislike to the American government."

In a letter of the 24th, the same ideas are repeated—

"Be assured, sir, that no exertions shall be wanting, on my part; but I cannot disguise from you, that I have a very difficult people to manage: to this moment, no opposition to the requisition has manifested itself, but I am not seconded with that *ardent zeal*, which, in my opinion, the crisis demands. We look with great anxiety to your movements, and place our greatest reliance for safety, on the energy and patriotism of the Western States. In Louisiana, there are many faithful citizens: these last persuade themselves, that Spain will soon repossess herself of Louisiana, and they seem to believe, that a combined Spanish and English force will soon appear on our coast. If Louisiana is invaded, I shall put myself at the head of such of my militia as will follow me to the field, and, *on receiving, shall obey your orders*. I need not assure you of my entire confidence in you, as a commander, and of the pleasure I shall experience in supporting all your measures for the common defence. but, sir, a cause of indescribable chagrin to me is, that I am not at the head of a willing and united people: native Americans, native Louisianians, Frenchmen and Spaniards, with some Englishmen, compose the mass of the population—among them, there exists much jealousy, and as great differences in political sentiments as in their language and habits. But, nevertheless, sir, if we are supported by a respectable body of regular troops, or of western militia, I trust I shall be able to bring to your aid, a valiant and faithful corps of Louisiana militia; but if we are left to rely *principally on our own resources*, I fear existing jealousies will lead to a distrust so general, that we shall be able to make but a feeble resistance."

On the 8th of September, the spirit of disaffection is said to be greater than was supposed —the country is said to be filled with *spies* and *traitors*: "Inclosed you have copies of my late general orders. They may, and I trust will be, obeyed; but to this moment my fellow-citizens have not manifested all that union and zeal the crisis demands, and their own safety requires. There is in this city a much greater spirit of disaffection than I had anticipated; and among the faithful Louisianians, there is a despondency which palsies all my preparations; they see no strong regular force, around which they could rally with confidence, and they seem to think themselves not within the reach of seasonable assistance from the western States. I am assured, sir, you will make the most judicious disposition of the forces under your command, but excuse me for suggesting that the presence of the seventh regiment, at or near New-Orleans, will have the most salutary effect,

The garrison here at present, is alarmingly weak, and is a cause of much regret: from the great mixture of persons, and characters, in this city, we have as much to apprehend from within as from without. In arresting the intercourse between New-Orleans and Pensacola, you have done right. Pensacola is, in fact, an enemy's post, and had our commercial intercourse with it continued, the supplies furnished to the enemy would have so much exhausted our own stock of provisions, as to have occasioned the most serious inconvenience to ourselves. I was on the point of taking on myself the prohibition of the trade with Pensacola: I had prepared a proclamation to that effect, and would have issued it the very day I heard of your interposition. Enemies to the country may blame you for your prompt and energetic measures; but, in the person of every patriot, you will find a supporter. I am very confident of the very lax police of this city, and indeed, throughout the State, with respect to the visits of strangers. I think, with you, that our country is filled with spies and traitors: I have written pressingly on the subject to the city authorities and parish judges. I hope some efficient regulations will speedily be adopted by the first, and more vigilance exerted for the future by the latter."

On the 12th of September, speaking of the drafts of militia, he says:—

"The only difficulty I have hitherto experienced in meeting the requisition, has been in this city, and exclusively from some European Frenchmen, who, after giving their adhesion to Louis XVIII, have, through the medium of the French Consul, claimed exemption from the drafts, as French subjects. The question of exemption, however, is now under discussion, before a special court of inquiry, and I am not without hopes that these ungrateful men may yet be brought to a discharge of their duties."

On the necessity of securing the country against the machinations of foreigners, he, on the 4th of Nov. informed the respondent—

"You have been informed of the contents of an intercepted letter, written by Colonel Coriel, a Spanish officer, to Capt. Morales, of Pensacola. This letter was submitted for the opinion of the Attorney-General of the State, as to measures to be pursued against the writer. The Attorney-General was of opinion, that the courts could take no cognizance of the same; but that the Governor might order the writer to leave the State, and in case of refusal, to send him off by force. I accordingly, Sir, ordered Col. Coriel to take his departure, in forty-eight hours, for Pensacola, and gave him the necessary passports. I hope this measure may meet your approbation. It is a just retaliation for the conduct lately observed by the Governor of Pensacola, and may induce the Spaniards residing among us, to be less communicative upon those subjects which relate to our military movements."

With the impressions this correspondence was calculated to produce, the respondent arrived in this city, where, in different conversations, the same ideas were enforced, and he was advised, not only by the Governor of the State, but very many influential persons, to proclaim MARTIAL LAW, as the only means of producing union, overcoming disaffection, detecting treason, and calling forth the energies of the country. This measure was discussed and recommended to the respondent, as he well recollects, in the presence of the Judge of this honorable Court, who not only made no objection, but seemed, by his gestures and silence, to approve of its being adopted. These opinions, respectable in themselves, derived greater weight from that which the Governor expressed of the Legislature then in session. He represented their fidelity as very doubtful; ascribed design to their prolonged session, and appeared extremely desirous that they should adjourn.

The respondent had also been informed, that in the House of Representatives, the idea, that a very considerable part of the State belonged to the Spanish Government, and ought not to be represented, had been openly advocated, and favorably heard. The co operation of the Spaniards with the English, was, at that time, a prevalent idea. This information, therefore, appeared highly important. He determined to examine, with the utmost care, all the facts that had been communicated to him; and not to act upon the advice he had received, until the clearest demonstration should have determined its propriety. He was then almost an entire stranger, in the place he was sent to defend, and unacquainted with the language of a majority of its inhabitants. While these circumstances were unfavorable to his obtaining information, on the one hand, they precluded, on the other, a suspicion that his measures were dictated by personal friendship, private animosity, or party views. Uninfluenced by such motives, he began his observations. He sought for information, and to obtain it, communicated with men of every description. He believed that even then he discovered those high qualities, which have since distinguished those brave defenders of their country; that the variety of language, the difference of habit, and even the national prejudices, which seemed to divide the inhabitants, might be made, if properly directed, the source of the most honorable emulation. Delicate attentions were necessary to foster this disposition; and the highest energy, to restrain the effects, that such an assemblage was calculated to produce; he determined to avail himself of both, and with this view called to his aid, the impulse of national feeling, the higher motives of patriotic sentiment, and the noble enthusiasm of valor. They operated in a manner which history will record: all who could be influenced by those feelings, rallied without delay, round the standard of their country.—Their efforts, however, would have been unavailing, if the disaffected had been permitted to counteract them by their treason, and the timid, to paralyze them by their example, and both to stand aloof in the hour of danger, and enjoy the fruit of victory without participating in the danger of defeat.

A disciplined and powerful army was on our coast, commanded by officers of tried valor and consummate skill; their fleet had already destroyed the feeble defence, on which, alone, we could rely to prevent their landing on our shores. Their point of attack was uncertain—a hundred inlets were to be guarded, by a force not sufficient in number for one; we had no lines of defence; treason lurked among us, and

only waited the moment of expected defeat, to show itself openly,—Our men were few, and of those few, not all were armed; our prospect of aid and supply was distant and uncertain; our utter ruin, if we failed, at hand, and inevitable; every thing depended on the prompt and energetic use of the means we possessed—on calling the whole force of the community into action; it was a contest for the very existence of the State, and every nerve was to be strained in its defence. The physical force of every individual, his moral faculties, his property, and the energy of his example, were to be called into action, and instant action. No delay—no hesitation—no inquiry about rights, or *all* was lost; and every thing dear to man, his property, life, the honor of his family, his country, its constitution and laws, were swept away by the avowed principles, the open practice of the enemy with whom we had to contend. Fortifications were to be erected, supplies procured, arms sought for, requisitions made, the emissaries of the enemy watched, lurking treason overawed, insubordination punished, and the contagion of cowardly example to be stopped.

In this crisis, and under a firm persuasion that none of those objects could be effected by the exercise of the ordinary powers confided to him —under a solemn conviction that the country committed to his care could be saved by that measure only, from utter ruin—under a religious belief, that he was performing the most important and sacred duty, the respondent proclaimed martial law. He intended by that measure, to supercede such civil powers as, in their operation, interfered with those he was obliged to exercise. He thought, in such a moment, constitutional forms must be suspended, for the permanent preservation of constitutional rights, and that there could be no question, whether it were best to depart for a moment, from the enjoyment of our dearest privileges, or have them *wrested* from us for ever. He knew, that if the civil magistrates were permitted to exercise their usual functions, none of the measures necessary to avert the awful fate that threatened us, could be expected. Personal liberty cannot exist at a time when every man is required to become a soldier. Private property cannot be secured when its use is indispensable to the public safety. Unlimited liberty of speech is incompatible with the discipline of a camp; and that of the press more dangerous still, when made the vehicle of conveying intelligence to the enemy, or exciting mutiny among the troops. To have suffered the uncontrolled enjoyment of any of those rights, during the time of the late invasion, would have been to abandon the defence of the country: the civil magistrate is the guardian of those rights, and the proclamation of martial law was, therefore, intended to supercede the exercise of his authority, so far as it interfered with the necessary restriction of those rights—*but no further.*

The respondent states these principles explicitly, because they are the basis of his defence, and because a mistaken notion has been circulated that the declaration of martial law only subjected the militia in service to its operation. This would, indeed, have been a very useless ceremony, as such persons were already subject to it, without the addition of any other act. Besides, if the proclamation of martial law were a measure of necessity,—a measure, without the exercise of which the country must unquestionably have been conquered, then does it form a complete justification for the act. If it do not, in what manner will the proceeding by attachment for contempt be justified? It is undoubtedly and strictly a criminal prosecution: and the constitution declares, that in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall have the benefit of a trial by jury; yet a prosecution is every now going on in this court, where no such benefit is allowed.—Why? From the alleged necessity of the case, because courts could not, it is said, subsist without a power to punish promptly by their own act, and without the intervention of a jury. Necessity then, may, in some cases, justify a departure from the constitution: and if, in the doubtful case of avoiding confusion in a court, shall it be denied in the serious one of preserving a country from conquest and ruin? The respondent begs leave to explain, that in using this argument, he does not mean to admit the existence of necessity in the case of attachment; but to show that the principle of a justification from necessity is admitted, even in the weaker case. If the legislature of the United States have given to courts the power to punish contempts, it is no answer to this defence, for two reasons—first, because the words of the law do not necessarily exclude the intervention of a jury; and secondly, if they do, the law itself is contrary to the words of the constitution, and can only be supported on the plea of necessity: to which head it is referred by the English writers on the subject.

The only responsibility which has been incurred in the present case, is that which arises from necessity. This, the respondent agrees must not be doubtful; it must be apparent from the circumstances of the case, or it forms no justification. He submits all his acts, therefore, to be tested by this rule.

To the forcible reasons which he has detailed as impelling him to this measure, he ought to add, that he has since, by the confession of the enemy himself, received a confirmation of the opinions, which he had then good reason to believe; that there were men among us so depraved as to give daily and exact information of our movements, and our forces; that the number of those persons was considerable, and their activity unceasing. The names of those wretches will probably be discovered; and the respondent persuades himself, that this tribunal will employ itself, with greater satisfaction, in inflicting the punishment due to their crimes, than it now does in investigating the measures that were taken to counteract them.

If example can justify, or the practice of others serve as a proof of necessity, the respondent has ample materials for his defence not from analogous construction, but from the conduct of all the different departments of the State Government, in the very case now under discussion.

The legislature of the State, having no constitutional power to regulate or restrain commerce, on the —— day of December last, passed an act laying an embargo—the executive sanctioned it; and from a conviction of its necessity, it was acquiesced in. The same legislature shut up the courts of justice for four months, to all civil suitors—the same executive

sanctioned that law, and the judiciary not only acquiesced, but solemnly approved it.

The Governor, as appears by one of the letters quoted, undertook to inflict the punishment of exile upon an inhabitant, without any form of law, merely because he thought that an individual's presence might be dangerous to the public safety.

The Judge of this very court, duly impressed with the emergency of the moment, and the necessity of employing every means of defence, consented to the discharge of men committed and indicted for capital crimes, without bail, and without recognizance; and probably under an impression that the exercise of his functions would be useless, absented himself from the place where his court was to be holden, and postponed its session during a regular term.

Thus the conduct of the legislative, executive, and judiciary branches of the Government of this State, have borne the fullest testimony of the existence of the necessity on which the respondent relies.

The unqualified approbation of the Legislature of the United States, and such of the individual states as were in session, ought as also to be admitted, as no slight means of defence; inasmuch as all these respectable bodies were fully apprized of his proclamation of martial law, and some of them seem to refer to it, by thanking him for the energy of his measures.

The respondent, therefore, believes he has established the necessity of proclaiming martial law. He has shown the effects of that declaration; and it only remains to prove, in answer to the rule, that the power assumed from necessity, was not abused in its exercise, nor improperly protracted in its duration.

All the acts mentioned in the rule, took place after the enemy had retired from the position they had at first assumed—after they had met with a signal defeat, and after an unofficial account had been received of the signature of a treaty of peace. Each of these circumstances might be, to one who did not see the whole ground, a sufficient reason for supposing that further acts of energy and vigour were unnecessary. On the mind of the respondent they had a different effect. The enemy had retired from their position, it is true; but they were still on the coast, and within a few hours sail of the city. They had been defeated, and with a loss; but the loss was not to be repaired by expected reinforcements. Their numbers still much more than quadrupled all the regular forces which the respondent could command; and the term of service of his most efficient militia force was about to expire. Defeat, to a powerful and active enemy, was more likely to operate as an incentive to renewed and increased exertion, than to inspire them with despondency, or to paralyze their efforts. A treaty, it is true, had been probably signed; yet it might not be ratified. Its contents had not transpired, and no reasonable conjecture could be formed, that it would be acceptable. The influence which the account of its signature had on the army, was deleterious in the extreme, and showed a necessity for increased energy, instead of a relaxation of discipline. Men, who had shown themselves zealous in the preceeding part of the campaign, now became lukewarm in the service. Those whom no danger could appal, and no labour discourage, complained of the hardships of the camp. When the enemy were no longer immediately before them, they thought themselves oppressed, by being detained in service. Wicked and weak men, who, from their situation in life, ought to have furnished a better example, secretly encouraged this spirit of insubordination. They affected to pity the hardships of those who were kept in the field; they tomented discontent, by insinuating that the merits of those to whom they addressed themselves, had not been sufficiently noticed or applauded; and to so high a degree had the disorder at length risen, that at one period, only fifteen men and one officer, out of a whole regiment, stationed to guard the very avenue through which the enemy had penetrated into the country, were found at their post. At another point equally important, a whole corps, on which the greatest reliance had been placed, operated upon by the acts of a foreign agent, suddenly deserted their post.

If trusting to an uncertain peace, the respondent had revoked his proclamation, or ceased to act under it, the fatal security, by which we were lulled, might have destroyed all discipline, have dissolved all his force, and left him without any means of defending the country against an enemy, instructed, by the traitors within our own bosom, of the time and place at which he might safely make his attack. In such an event, his life might have been offered up; yet it would have been but a feeble expiation, for the disgrace and misery, into which, by his criminal negligence, he had permitted the country to be plunged.

He thought peace a probable, but by no means a certain event. If it had really taken place, a few days must bring the official advice of it; and he believed it better to submit, during those few days, to the salutary restraints imposed, than to put every thing dear to ourselves and country at risk, upon an uncertain contingency. Admit the chances to have been a hundred or a thousand to one in favor of the ratification, and against any renewed attempts of the enemy, what should we say or think of the prudence of the man, who would stake his life, his fortune, his country, and his honor, even with such odds in his favor, against a few days' anticipated enjoyment of the blessings of peace? The respondent could not bring himself to play so deep a hazard; uninfluenced by the clamors of the ignorant and the designing, he continued the exercise of that law which necessity had compelled him to proclaim; and he still thinks himself justified, by the situation of affairs, for the course which he adopted and pursued. Has he exercised this power wantonly or improperly? If so, he is liable; not, as he believes, to this honorable court for contempt, but to his government for an abuse of power, and to those individuals whom he has injured, in damages proportioned to that injury.

About the period last described, the consul of France, who appears, by Governor Claiborne's letter, to have embarrassed the first drafts, by his claims in favor of pretended subjects of his king, renewed his interference; his certificates were given to men in the ranks of the army; to some who had never applied, and to others who wished to use them as the means of obtaining an inglorious exemption from danger

and fatigue. The immunity derived from these certificates not only thinned the ranks, by the withdrawal of those to whom they were given, but produced the desertion of others, who thought themselves equally entitled to the privilege; and to this cause must be traced the abandonment of the important post of Chef Menteur, and the temporary refusal of a relief ordered to occupy it.

Under these circumstances, to remove the force of an example which had already occasioned such dangerous consequences, and to punish those who were so willing to defend what they were so ready to enjoy, the respondent issued a general order, directing those French subjects who had availed themselves of the consul's certificates, to remove out of the lines of defence, and far enough to avoid any temptation of intercourse with our enemy, whom they were so scrupulous of opposing. This measure was resorted to, as the mildest mode of proceeding against a dangerous and increasing evil; and the respondent had the less scruple of his power, in this instance, as it was not quite so strong as that which Governor Clairborne had exercised, before the invasion, by the advice of his attorney general, in the case of Col. Coliel.

It created, however, some sensation,—discontents were again fomented, from the source that had first produced them. Aliens and strangers became the most violent advocates of constitutional rights, and native Americans were taught the value of their privileges, by those who formally disavowed any title to their enjoyment. The order was particularly opposed, in an anonymous publication. In this, the author deliberately and wickedly misrepresented the order, as subjecting to removal, all Frenchmen whatever, even those who had gloriously fought in defence of the country: and after many dangerous and unwarrantable declarations, he closes, by calling upon all Frenchmen to flock to the standard of their Consul—thus advising and producing an act of mutiny and insubordination, and publishing the evidence of our weakness and discord to the enemy, who were still in our vicinity, anxious, no doubt, before the cessation of hostilities, to wipe away the late stain upon their arms. To have silently looked on such an offence, without making any attempt to punish it, would have been a formal surrender of all discipline, all order, all personal dignity, and public safety. This could not be done; and the respondent immediately ordered the arrest of the offender. A writ of habeas corpus was directed to issue for his enlargement. The very case which had been foreseen, the very contingency on which martial law was intended to operate, had now occurred: the civil magistrate seemed to think it his duty to enforce the enjoyment of civil rights, although the consequences which have been described, would probably have resulted. An unbending sense of what he seemed to think his station required, induced him to order the liberation of the prisoners. This, under the respondent's sense of duty, produced a conflict which it was his wish to avoid.

No other course remained, than to enforce the principles which he had laid down as his guide, and to suspend the exercise of this judicial power, wherever it interfered with the necessary means of defence. The only way effectually to do this, was to place the Judge in a situation in which his interference could not counteract the measures of defence, or give countenance to the mutinous disposition that had shown itself in so alarming a degree. Merely to have disregarded the writ, would but have increased the evil, and to have obeyed it, was wholly repugnant to the respondent's ideas of the public safety, and to his own sense of duty. The Judge was therefore confined, and removed beyond the lines of defence.

As to the paper mentioned in the rule, which the respondent is charged with taking and detaining, he answers, that when the writ was produced by the clerk of this honorable court, the date of its issuance appeared to have been altered from the 5th to the 6th. He was questioned respecting the apparent alteration, and acknowledged it had been done by Judge Hall, and not in the presence of the party who made the affidavit. This material alteration, in a paper that concerned him, gave the respondent, as he thought, a right to detain it for further investigation, which he accordingly did; but gave a certified copy, and an acknowledgement that the original was in his possession.

The respondent avows: that he considered this alteration in the date of the affidavit, as it was then explained to him by the clerk, to be such evidence of a personal, not judicial interference, and activity, in behalf of a man charged with the most serious offence, as justified the idea then formed, that the judge approved his conduct, and supported his attempts to excite disaffection among the troops

This was the conduct of the respondent, and these the motives which prompted it. They have been fairly and openly exposed to this tribunal, and to the world, and would not have been accompanied by any exception or waver of jurisdiction, if it had been deemed expedient to give him that species of trial, to which he thinks himself entitled, by the constitution of his country. The powers which the exigency of the times forced him to assume, have been exercised exclusively for the public good; and by the blessing of God, they have been attended with unparalled success. They have saved the country; and whatever may be the opinion of that country, or the decrees of its courts, in relation to the means he has used, he can never regret that he employed them.

ANDREW JACKSON.

For the United States Telegraph

Will they give them up?

Give up whom? Adams, Clay & Co.?

Why is Mr. Adams like a Brick-maker?

Because he moulds *Clay* to his wishes.

Why is Mr. Adams on ticklish grounds?

Because he stands on *slippery Clay*, leans on a *Rush*, and hopes something from the *Southard*.

Why has Mr. Adams an aversion to the Postmaster General?

Because he has a dislike to *make clean* (McLean) the Augean Stables.

Why is Mr. Adams like a Carpenter?

Because he is not a Mason.

What will Mr. Adams do on the next 4th of March?

Echo———March.

Yours, BILLY BLACK, Jr

LETTER XIX.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, & Joseph P. Norris, Jr. Esquires—Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of the 7th July.

GENTLEMEN....In our sixteenth letter, we were inquiring into the *services* and *measures* of Mr. Adams, in order to ascertain the correctness of your representation, that he is an illustrious patriot and statesman: and we had intended to pursue the inquiry, minutely, in succeeding letters: the desire, however, to publish, in a pamphlet form, what we have already written, interrupts our progress, and we shall at present notice those topics in a very brief manner.

It cannot escape public observation, that, there is, throughout the addresses in favor of the administration, a dearth of information respecting *services* and *measures*: So remarkable an uniformity could not have been accidental: We are justified in supposing, therefore, that it really was the result of a want of adequate materials.—Up to 1809, we have already accompanied Mr. Adams, in his diplomatic career, without finding any result, honorable to the fame, or useful to the interests of his country. Let us see whether he was more distinguished subsequently.

From 1809 to 1814, Mr. Adams was in Russia: We have no knowledge, we never have heard, that his services extended beyond a residence at St. Petersburgh: He was greedy in the accumulation of the large sums paid by his "penurious" country; but we have yet to learn that any return of national benefit was made.

In 1814, we find Mr. Adams at Ghent: in the execution of this trust, if we are to believe Mr. Clay, there was not displayed, by Mr. Adams, either patriotism or statesmanship: On the contrary, he was anxious to give up national interests to purchase a sectional advantage for the East. Let the friends of those gentlemen, however, settle this matter, if they can: A day, we hope, will arise, when the veil which hides the "secret night" trasactions at Ghent, will be rent, and salutary truths made known to an abused people.

Mr. Adams subsequently proceeded to London, and remained there until 1816. There were many matters, dependent upon the treaty of Ghent, which demanded efficient attention, but we have no knowledge that any of them were at this period adjusted.

Here ends the career of Mr. Adams, as a foreign minister: It is incredible, that, if, in the course of twenty years, he really had effected any object of moment for his country, an utter silence respecting it would be observed: On the contrary, when so much is said pompously and gratuitously, we may well conclude, that the subject will not bear examination. We have no doubt, that Mr. Adams was a constant and voluminous correspondent, but we have no knowledge of results of his diplomacy, denoting patriotism and statesmanship.

Let us then, hastily, pass with him through the cabinet, from 1816 to 1825. The field, here opened, was sufficiently extensive for the display of every talent, natural or acquired: and if the duties comprehended merely a train of elaborate, and often elegant compositions, we should not hesitate to confer high praise: But, if sound advice and salutary actions, are the tests of a minister, we must refuse to place Mr. Adams in the rank which is claimed for him.

What, in the whole course of his ministry, did he effect with *France*? If the government of the United States had released France from responsibility, for spoliations prior to the purchase of Louisiana, at least indemnity was due for the losses of American citizens, by the outrages of France subsequent to that period. Those losses in all probability exceeded twenty millions of dollars, yet it does not appear that any efficient effort has been made to obtain remuneration.

On the purchase of Florida from France, an illustrious patriot or statesman never would have pursued the course taken by Mr. Adams: it was wholly immaterial to France, how the purchase money should be applied, that question rested with the United States alone; a faithful Minister, in fixing the amount to be applied to the payment of losses by his countrymen, would have taken such limits as would embrace every fair claim: Mr. Adams, however, limited the indemnity for losses to five millions, whereas the actual claims amounted to twenty millions: the injurious effects of this arrangement were severely felt, upon the decision of the commissioners. According to the principles of justice and sound policy, there ought to have been no limit, but the extent of the fund, and thus all honest claimants would have been indemnified.

The United States had been the first to acknowledge the independence of *South America* and *Mexico*, they were sister republics in the same hemisphere; we had claims of gratitude and sympathy to prefer; yet we have seen the diplomacy of England stripping us of advantages, politically and commercially important. The incapacity and failure of Mr. Adams, in this respect, were exposed by Mr. Clay himself, in the debates in 1820, upon the Spanish treaty.

In the negotiations with *Spain*, Mr Adams evinced a want of capacity, or zeal, which afforded Mr. Clay an opportunity to rebuke him before the nation. It has never been explained why, in negotiating with Spain, the territory of Texas was given to Spain—a territory which, according to Mr. Clay, Spain herself had agreed to consider within the boundaries of Louisiana—a territory comprehending six degrees of latitude, from the 26th to the 32d N. and about nine degrees of longitude, from the Riodel Norde to the Sabine. To arrest such a transfer, and to rebuke Mr. Adams, Mr. Clay laid these resolutions on the table of the House of Representatives, on the 20th March, 1820.

"*Resolved*, That the constitution vests in congress, the power to dispose of the territory belonging to the United States, and that no treaty, proposing to alienate any portion thereof is valid, without the concurrence of congress:

"*Resolved*, That the equivalent proposed to be given by Spain to the United States, in the treaty concluded between them, on the 22d day of February, 1809, for that part of Louisiana, lying west of the Sabine, was inade

quate, and that it would be inexpedient to make a transfer thereof to any foreign power, or to renew the aforesaid treaty."

These resolutions spoke a language not to be misunderstood: they show the conviction of Mr. Clay in 1820, that Mr. Adams was either incompetent or unfaithful: the debates, on the subject, set all doubts at rest: Mr. Clay charged Mr. Adams with subserviency to foreign policy, in regard to Spain and her late colonies, and said that a single expression of Lord Castlereagh had guided the course of the United States: I am quite refreshed, said Mr. Clay, at reading a paper from the pen of Count Nisselrode, "after 'perusing those (he was sorry to say it, he 'wished there was a veil thick and broad enough 'to conceal them forever) which this (the Span-'ish treaty negotiated by Mr. Adams) had pro-'duced on the part of the government:" The valuable territory, however, was given up—whether owing to Mr. Adams' infidelity or incompetency, we leave the friends of Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay to decide; that the territory was lost by one or the other is indisputable.

Pursuing our inquiry beyond the period of Mr. Adams's election, we see the same incompetency or indifference as to our relations with *England*. The Colonial trade had been the topic of discussion for many years—if it had not been considered important to the United States, this would not have been the case. The British ministry, departing from their usual policy, offered to relax their Colonial system in favor of the United States, not doubting but that the proposal would be met in a spirit of liberality, leading to greater results—the offer was, however, so grossly neglected, and the excuses for the neglect were so contradictory, that the British ministry withdrew the overture, and Mr. Canning explained the act in a rebuke, highly inculpating the government of the United States. It is extremely probable, that attention to electioneering, produced neglect of public duty in this case—from July 1824, to June 1826, there was a neglect either to renew negotiations at Washington, or to send the necessary instructions to England.

....With regard to the *measures* of the administration. What new principle, or measure, has Mr. Adams ever proposed, to promote the interests of agriculture, trade or manufactures? What has he done to develope the resources of the country from its soil, mines, woods or fisheries? Has he suggested any new source of revenue, or any improvement in any that exists? In the entire organization of the existing system, are not things exactly as they were planned and left by his predecessors? What an absurdity, then, to claim a merit for the administration from any existing prosperity—the boast of the fly on the chariot wheel, that its agency produced the motion, is not more ridiculous.

No person of candor can have regarded passing events with any sort of care, without being entirely satisfied, that the great interests of the nation have been merged in the anxiety of the men in power to keep it, if at all practicable—the committee of retrenchment made developements, which, in any individual case, would have stripped any man of the confidence of his employers—the three cases of Mr. John A. King, Mr. J. H. Pleasants, and Mr. Cook, member of Congress from Illinois, are sufficient to explain this fully:

1. *Mr. John A. King.* The act of Congress of May 1, 1810, (section 2, page 309, of vol. 4, laws U. S.) expressly declares, that no compensation shall be allowed to any *charge des affaires*, who shall not have been appointed by the President United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President during a recess, and afterwards approved by Senate. No one has ever pretended that Mr. John A. King was embraced in either of these cases, yet Mr Adams directed $5,258 15 to be paid to him for 62 days pretended services, and it was paid to him, in open violation of law

2. *Mr. John H. Pleasants*, an administration editor, received 1,940 dollars as the bearer of despatches from the United States to Buenos Ayres, although he has himself confessed that he never went to Buenos Ayres; that he gave the despatches to the captain of a vessel bound there; and that, instead of executing the duty for which he was paid, he made a pleasant tour in England!

3. *Mr. Cook* gave the vote of Illinois to Mr. Adams, contrary to the will of his constituents; his constituents dismissed him; the administration then gave him a secret agency to Cuba, at a compensation of 5500 dollars, of which he received 1500—he was in bad health, did not understand the Spanish language—was but a few weeks at the Havana—from whence he returned, without effecting any object whatever! In this case, for the first time since the formation of the government, the Executive refused to disclose to Congress the object of a mission—the constitution imperatively directs the President to give information to Congress; a committee of Congress asked it; it was refused, without any pretence, that the public interest demanded concealment!

When such abuses as these are considered, it is not surprising, that the contingent expenses of the executive department, in 1825-6-7 under Mr. Adams, exceeded the like expenses under Mr. Monroe, in 1822-3-4, in the sum of $306,596 dollars!

....We have not ventured, to present our naked opinions, in relation to *services and measures*, but to refer to the absence of proof: it is well known, that Mr. Jefferson set a very different estimate upon the qualifications of Mr. Adams, from that fixed by his friends: Mr. Jefferson considered Mr. Adams merely a fine *belles lettres scholar*, but that, if he was called on for the exercise of his *judgment*, it was a cross and pile chance whether he was right or wrong: This opinion accords so remarkably with those of Gov. Giles, a gentleman long conversant with public affairs and men, that we close our letter with an extract from his address of the 28th of February last:

"I believe (says Gov. Giles) that Mr Adams does not possess the necessary useful practical talents, for administering any government whatever, and that Gen. Jackson's talents for that object are incomparably greater than Mr. Adam's! Whilst I am willing to admit, that Mr Adams may be, more than Gen. Jackson, the poet *born*, and more the scholar *made*; I believe Mr. Adams not to be a wise man, that he possesses very few of the attributes of wisdom.

f must stick to my definition of terms. I believe Mr. Adams is not wise in conduct—not wise in actions. I believe he is not blessed with the happy talent of choosing the best measures; nor the best means of carrying his chosen measures into effect. To be in the fashion, particularly with "the Anti Jackson Convention," I must coin a word to convey my ideas of Mr. Adams in this respect: I believe Mr. Adams to be an anti-wise man. The whole history of his life will prove the correctness of these convictions, but I will specify a few cases only, in demonstration. His letter to the committee, before quoted, grounded, I think, upon fallacious misrepresentations, extending even to a point of incredibility: His various efforts in various papers, but particularly in his first message to Congress, to derive powers to the general government from sources paramount to the constitution, or from his own peculiarly eccentric interpretation of the constitution. His conduct in the whole of his intercourse with Great Britain, by which we have not only lost the West India trade, but diminished the rest of our British trade, and hazarded the whole—a trade amounting to more than one-half of our foreign trade, and thus introducing a state of impoverishment in the United States unknown here before. I think Mr. Adams has been particularly anti-wise in all his most important diplomatic negotiations, particularly so in his treaties of limits, both with Spain and Great Britain: in the one, he lost the Texas; in the other, he has reduced us to the disgraceful arbitrament of a foreign power, for a territory on her north-eastern boundary, equal, perhaps greater in extent than the whole State of New-Hampshire. I conceive Mr. Adams particularly anti-wise, in his claims to executive powers, especially in relation to his competency to originate foreign missions without the consent of the Senate; particularly as that question was settled in his own person against such right, about the close of Mr. Jefferson's Administration. Without impugning at this time the policy of his Panama Mission, I think one of the reasons he assigned for it the most anti-wise that could have entered into the imagination of man—to liberalize the South American Catholics, on the score of religion. This most eccentric notion has perhaps, tended more than any thing else, to deprive us of the valuable favor of the South American Republics. This catalogue of anti-wise measures must suffice, although *it is but just begun*."

Respectfully, yours, &c.

JOSEPH WORRELL,	WM. J. DUANE,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,	WM. J. LEIPER,
WILLIAM BOYD,	CHAS S. COXE,
HENRY TOLAND,	THOS. M. PETTIT.

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

Sept. 15th, 1828.

LETTER XX.

To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Esqrs. Authors of an address adopted at the administration town meeting of the 7th July.

Gentlemen—The field of discussion, which we had intended to traverse in every part, has been circumscribed: the detail, in relation to the services and measures of Mr. Adams, into which we had designed to enter, has been confined to a very few points: and we now proceed to close the letters, which it became our duty to write.

Duty, we say, called upon us to write them; for, according to the spirit of our institutions, we conceive, that no man can, with propriety, shrink from the execution of a trust, conferred upon him by any considerable portion of his fellow-citizens.

A convention of republican delegates, from the various counties of Pennsylvania, which assembled at Harrisburg, on the 8th of January last, to nominate an electoral ticket, favourable to Gen. A. Jackson, and Mr. J. C. Calhoun, appointed us a committee of correspondence for this city: Custom had long rendered it the duty of such committees, to sustain the cause, proposed to be promoted; yet, it is certainly true, that we did not anticipate a necessity for any other attention on our part, than that which would be required, in maintaining a correspondence with our own political friends. The presses, we thought, were sufficiently numerous, and their conductors sufficiently zealous, to enable the people at large to obtain all the information, necessary to the exposition of truth.

But you, gentlemen, thought, as you had an undoubted right, to think differently: You deemed the cause of the administration so weak, or its editorial supporters so unworthy, as to demand the exercise of your own personal talents and influence.

To this, no one could, with the least propriety, have objected; on the contrary, if you had explained the principles, services, and measures, of Mr. Adams, even in the language of high panegyric, we do not believe that we should have considered ourselves bound to attempt to strip him of a single ornament.

Very different, however, was the course pursued: upon the anniversary of the nation's birth, the best feelings were perverted, from its solemnization, to the development of party passions; and ere the excitement, then produced, had ceased to operate, it was deemed politic to convene a general assemblage of your partisans.

Those, who have been observers of men and things, saw in this popular assembly a departure from the former principles and practices of many of those, who now attended: It had long been their opinion, that more evil than advantage resulted from town-meetings; and so far as the meeting of the 7th July is to be the criterion, the sentiment is undoubtedly sanctioned.

Harangues were pronounced, on that occasion, well calculated to reconcile incongruous materials to each other, and to rouse them to unity in action against the rest of their fellow citizens: Yet, if the proceedings had ended there, we should not have had a desire to interrupt your course: the sober reflection of many, who were present, would, we were sure, succeed an unnatural excitement, and produce even regret at such an example of popular excess: We saw the youth of your party tread in the footsteps of their fathers, and rival them in zeal to tear all the honors, conferred by his country, from the hoary head of a public benefactor; and we believed, that fathers would not upon reflection, deem such rudeness the indi-

cation of future usefulness, any more than at present modesty.

But the ebullition did not end with the meeting; an address, avowedly from gentlemen in all respects entitled to regard, was ushered to the world, not only accusing the candidate of our choice of the most atrocious crimes known in savage or civilized life, but denouncing his friends without distinction as a faction, influenced by the worst passions, and seeking to gratify them by the basest means!

We felt ourselves bound, therefore, by respect for public opinion and for ourselves, to defend our candidate, our principles and ourselves. We took up the pen, just as the republican committee of 1799, did, upon a similar occasion, when the late Gov. M'Kean was assailed, and addressed ourselves directly to those who, by their names, as the authors of the address, pledged themselves to the public for its correctness.

....To notice an address, such as, in moments of calmness, you must confess yours to be, was not an easy task—with the utmost desire to avoid excitement on our part, it was almost necessarily produced by a sort of contact with your own; and with all possible desire to respect your motives and feelings, it was difficult to refrain from severe censure upon your acts: If, in any instance, we passed the true line of sound discretion, it must have been because you had broken down the distinctive boundaries, and laid all waste before you; but, we have no remembrance of excess on our part, and if there was any, we lament it sincerely.

In short, gentlemen, as we have said throughout, we forbear to assign invidious motives; we attribute your conduct to an excitement, altogether factitious. What else could excuse such extreme intemperance? Thirty years ago, intemperance equally great was directed against the late Governor M'Kean and the late President Jefferson; yet we saw the memories of those patriots honored by many of the very persons who had been amongst their revilers In the natural course of things, you, gentlemen, will long survive Gen. Jackson, and we shall not be at all surprised to see you, anxious to atone in death for the great injustice done to him in life!

No doubt it was your right, nay your duty, to scrutinize his conduct and character—but, in doing so, it became you to inquire dispassionately—to consider whether it was likely, that nearly all the distinguished men in the south and West, to say nothing of the mass of the people there and in your own State, were all deceived? Or whether it was not more likely that you were yourselves mistaken? At least, some degree of calmness would have been thus produced.

But, instead of that, you ran with the raging current of detraction; and now, in truth, it may well be asked, whether one of the causes of Gen. Jackson's election, for elected he certainly will be, will not have been—the cruel and relentless manner in which he has been assailed? For it cannot be the interest or the wish of any man, who loves his country, that it should present the spectacle which you have aided to uphold. On the contrary, it seems to be the serious duty of good men to resist the torrent which seeks to overwhelm all the considerations that produce respect abroad or charity at home.

If this is not so, what must be the results? Virtuous men will refuse to be candidates.—Those who look to the gratitude and honors to be conferred by the country, for faithful service will cease to have such incentives: Reputation and capacity will no longer be valuable, if public stations are to be gained by disgusting hieroglyphics, and not by sound arguments, by appeals to the vilest passions, rather than to the sober discretion of the people.

Are the citizens of the United States anxious for such a race as this? If such races are to be run, must they not at last terminate in favor of the most profligate? What distinguishes the scenes now before us from the mobs of Legendre, but the absence of a dense population? In spirit, the mode of opposition adopted against Gen. Jackson, is the same which covered Paris with blood—age and sex are no protection, and the grave itself is called to give up its dead, not for the fair scrutiny of public character, but in search of the feculent materials of personal slander.

....In reverting to what duty has called upon us to lay before the public eye, we rejoice to find, that temptation to retaliate did not induce us to pass the boundary of fair discussion: We are not conscious, that we approached the confines of private reputation, or that we improperly sought in unworthy motives to find the sources of public actions. We have indeed desired, by argument and explanation, to show that ambitious and selfish passions have been the governing impulses of Mr. Adams and Mr Clay:—whether our arguments have been adequate to the proposed end, our fellow-citizens will decide.

We have defended Gen. Jackson, by exposing the unfairness, and the fallacy of the charges against him: by showing the confidence reposed in him by all our presidents: by exhibiting his uniform disinterestedness, and generous devotion; by proving the uniformity of his principles, and their liberality withal; by showing that he is not in favor of treating any of his countrymen as the Catholics of Ireland are treated, without confidence or honor, but that he deems it patriotic, just and politic to "judge of the tree by its fruits," and to regard all men as equal in claims to public trusts, who are true to their country. We have shown, that he never was, and is not, at the head of any faction that he never has sought power, but has often refused high stations yielding great emoluments; that he has, from principle, shunned intercourse or acts calculated to give the opportunity to create influence: He has made no contracts, he has no successor designated; he will be the president of a nation and not of a section of it, the father of a whole people, not the patron of a favored class.

We have also inquired into the principles, services, and measures of Mr. Adams, and have failed to find the evidences of the patriotism and statesmanship, which his friends assign to him His whole career has been marked by a regard to his personal interests; we know no instance in which he made a single sacrifice for his country: whilst Jefferson, Clinton, and other patriots have sunk into the tomb, leaving no inheritance to their children but a glorious repu

tation, Mr. Adams will leave the public service, after having amassed an immense fortune; And for all this what will he have left, that will survive him?—There will be volumes of composition, remarkable for goodness of style rather than soundness of instruction, for brilliancy of language rather than solidity of judgment; volumes that will give but an imperfect light upon the future path in diplomacy. What *acts*, what *results*, will appear upon the page of history?

....Personal considerations or merits, however, are of minor import: The question, now to be settled, is *vital*: "*Never*" said Judge Rowan of Kentucky, in his most able letter, '*never will the people by an unbiassed vote elect* 'another president—*if Mr. Adams shall be re-* 'elected: *The struggle, on the part of the admin-* 'istration is to sustain itself in the violation of 'the public will, and to perpetuate its ill gotten 'power, by a mis-exercise of the patronage be- 'longing to it: *The effort on the part of the peo-* 'ple, is to assert the power of their will, and to 'vindicate its predominant authority: If Mr. 'Adams shall be re-elected it will be an evi- 'dence that the power of the patronage of the 'government is too strong for the power of pub- 'lic sentiment: The contest will never be re- 'newed, on the part of the people, under hap- 'pier auspices; they never can again expect to 'select an individual from among themselves of 'more deserving that Gen. Jackson—one to- 'wards whom the public esteem, gratitude, and 'affection so obviously and intensely converge. 'If the power of the government, with its strat- 'agems and intrigues, shall, *in this instance*, 'prove too strong for the violated and insulted 'will of the people, *it will, at every subsequent* '*occasion*, be found still stronger"....

....And, if it will increase in force, what will follow? This is a question, which we put to all good men; What will be the consequence, if corrupt factions shall triumph? Can the republic subsist? Will it not become a prey to an oligarchy? What will be left to the people, but the odious liberty left to the Poles,—of registering their own debasement.

Against such a calamity, we ask all good men to protect their country—and, from the shame of producing such a bondage, we ask all good men to release themselves.

JOSEPH WORRELL,
WILLIAM DUNCAN,
WILLIAM BOYD,
HENRY TOLAND,
JOHN WURTS,
WILLIAM J. DUANE,
WILLIAM J. LEIPER,
CHARLES S. COXE,
THOMAS M. PETTIT,

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, appointed by the Republican Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, Jan. 8th, 1828.

September 16th, 1828.

Mr. CLAY.

The Delaware Patriot suggests, that Mr. Clay desires a seat on the Supreme Court Bench. We have no doubt that he desires to be placed beyond the reach of the people, but we mistake the character of the Senate of the United States, if that body permits Mr. Adams to impose *any partisan* upon that elevated station

From the Boston Statesman.

MR. GREENE: A late number of the *Boston Patriot*, in a feeble attempt to accuse Mr Jarvis of political inconsistency, introduces the following assertion; "*Derby's affidavit which few persons believed*," &c —I am that "*Derby*," and *my affidavit* published in the Boston Statesman in November, 1824, is the *affidavit* which, according to the Patriot, "*few persons believed.*" I think it my duty to notice this assertion, not for the purpose of proving its *falsity; that* is known to every reader of the opposition papers for the last four years;—but because the Patriot, with characteristic meanness, has repeatedly suppressed part of the evidence in confirmation of my affidavit.—This is the second time that paper has intimated that the charge against Mr. Adams of "a design to destroy the democratic party" rests on my testimony *alone;* and then by calling me an interested witness, with admirable complacency it pronounces the charge repelled. Such conduct is worthy of a journal once the scorn of that party which it now caresses, the federalists, and *now* the ungrateful assailant of consistent republicans, its old and generous patrons! I speak of the *paper;* for I am ignorant who *now* mixes the ingredients of the sleeping potion daily in its pages administered to the public Nor do I feel myself injured by any of its scurrilous remarks. On the contrary, the "Boston Patriot" has so long been notorious for its slanderous attacks on the most patriotic and illustrious citizens, that it is an *honor* to an humble individual not to be thought unworthy of its hostility.

Many persons who knew the origin of my affidavit in 1824, have probably forgotten the *facts* connected with it; and many who then gave them little attention, may now be induced by the excitement of the moment, to consider them more attentively. Truth must and will *ultimately* prevail: it is of the utmost importance that it *now* prevail. At the last election Mr Adams was not the choice of the people. That sin lies not yet at their door. But *now* if he is *re-elected*, it will be the deliberate act of the people; a calamity which (I conscientiously believe) every friend of the constitution, of republican principles, of political integrity, honor and fidelity, should supplicate Heaven to avert. I trust, therefore, that I shall not be thought impertinent, if in reply to the assertion of the Patriot, that "my affidavit" of 1824 "was believed by few persons," I state briefly the history of that affidavit, and disclose some *new facts* tending to substantiate the charge made against Mr. Adams.

During the summer of 1824, certain essays by "one of the people" appeared in the American Statesman, published at Boston, in opposition to the election of John Quincy Adams:—In one of these essays, the writer made the following charge against Mr. Adams:—

"About the same time, (viz: in the spring of 1807,) at the table of an illustrious citizen, now no more, he (Mr. Adams) lamented the fearful progress of the democratic party, and of its principles, and declared that he had long meditated the subject, and had become convinced that the only method *by which the democratic party could be destroyed*, was by *joining with* it, and urging it on with the utmost energy reluctantly, but with an unprejudiced mind, I

came forward with my testimony. I published in the Statesman of Nov. 9, 1824, my affidavit *under oath*, of which the following is an exact copy:

"I, John B. Derby, of Dedham late of Medfield, in the county of Norfolk, of lawful age, testify and say, That one evening in the summer of 1820, being at the house of Horatio Townsend, Esq., of Dedham, conversing with said Townsend on the political character of John Q Adams, and objecting to Mr. Adams on the ground of his desertion of federal principles, said Townsend asserted, that Mr. Adams was at heart a federalist although acting with the democratic party, and for proof thereof stated, that he (Mr Townsend) being many years before in company with Mr. Adams and other distinguished federalists, previous to Mr. Adams's political conversion (I think at the late Chief Justice Parsons') Mr Adams in speaking of the increasing power of the democratic party, used in substance the expressions attributed to him by the author of "one of the people," published in the Statesman in July last. Afterwards in the spring (I think) of 1822, said Townsend being at my house in Medfield, on my again introducing the discussion of the same subject, repeated to me the same declaration of Mr. Adams in similar language. That John Q. Adams ever made such observations I do not know, but I was constrained to believe that he made them, by the frequent and confident assertions of Mr. Townsend. That Mr. Townsend said in substance what I have here stated, is confirmed by the Hon. James Richardson, who says that on hearing the extract from "one of the people" read to him, he immediately recollected having heard Mr. Townsend, in substance, so express himself in conversation to him, once at said Townsend's house, and also at his office, and that it occurred to him before he (Mr. R) knew that *he* was designated as one of those to whom the above statements of Mr. Townsend were addressed."—John B. Derby. "The pieces signed "one of the people" are written with so much talent that it is hardly necessary for me to add that I am not the author."

Norfolk, ss. Nov. 8th, 1824. Then the above named John B. Derby declared on oath, that the above statement, by him subscribed, was true. EPASTUS WORTHINGTON,
Justice of Peace.

[See Statesman, Nov. 9th, 1824.]

This affidavit was confirmed by the testimony of the Hon. James Richardson, formerly a Senator of Massachusetts, then and now President of the Bar of the county of Norfolk, a gentleman of great respectability, and unsuspected veracity. He stated as follows—

Dedham, Nov. 8th, 1824.

I have read the part of the within affidavit which relates to myself, and declare it to be substantially correct.

JAMES RICHARDSON.

It will be remarked that the assertion made by me, that "I am not the writer of the essays by "one of the people" is not included in the body of the affidavit. I intended that it should be a part of it, and I now solemnly disclaim being the author of those essays.

In the "Patriot" of Nov. 9, 1824, appeared the following affidavit of Horatio Townsend, Esq. which the intatuated zealots of the Adams party construed as a denial of the charge in the Statesman, but which the cool-headed men of all parties considered as a full but reluctant confession of its truth.

Dedham, 6th Nov. 1824.

Norfolk, ss.

I, Horatio Townsend, Clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court and of the Court of Common Pleas, &c. for this county, having this day heard read to me the article in the American Statesman and City Register of this date, headed "explanatory," hereby make solemn oath, that I have no recollection of ever having dined at the table of the late Honorable Theuphilus Parsons in company with Mr. John Quincy Adams, nor do I believe that I ever did. Nor do I recollect or believe that I ever met Mr. Adams in company with the late Chief Justice Parsons at any time subsequent to my leaving Mr. Parsons' office as a student in the spring of 1788. HORATIO TOWNSEND.

Norfolk, ss. Nov. 6th, 1824.

Then the above named Horatio Townsend made oath to the truth of the foregoing affidavit by him subscribed.

Before me, THERON METCALF.
Justice of Peace.

It was supposed that the testimony of two witnesses (Mr. Richardson and myself) whose credibility stood unimpeached, and one of whom sustained a conspicuous rank in the community, would be sufficient to convince all reasonable men, that Horatio Townsend had actually reported to us and attributed to Mr. Adams the sentiments alleged by "one of the people."—More especially when it appeared that Townsend in his affidavit, avoided all direct denial of the fact, and confined himself to disproving a collateral and unimportant circumstance. But these are times when men "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel!" There are multitudes who cannot be convinced that the man who once betrayed and calumniated his party for political advancement, could be so dishonorable as to meditate a *second* treachery, and yet will readily believe that a fortunate General, who at the head of a victorious and devoted army *preserved the constitution* and *saved the country*, waits only the acquisition of civil power to effect their destruction!

One axiom in morals seems to have become obsolete, viz: That compunctious visitings are *less* poignant on the repetition of an offence; and that he who nobly resists a powerful temptation adds strength and security to his virtue.

The "Boston Patriot" would have it believed that my affidavit stood *alone* and unsupported by any confirmatory testimony. Did the editor of that paper never read in the Statesman of Aug. 9th, 1824, the following extract of a letter from a gentleman of a distant State of exalted character and worth?—"There is a piece in the Boston Statesman of the 22d instant," (the essay by "one of the people," before quoted) "which has brought to my recollection an information that I received from a gentleman of very high standing in New York many years past, and which I have frequently thought of since. The same gentleman has shown himself a warm advocate for Mr. Adams—he said that Mr. Adams called on him, either going or

returning from Congress," (probably in 1807) and said:—It was in vain to contend with the democratic party as a party,—the people were with them,—and to *succeed we must take sides with them*; our talents will induce them to embrace us—we should in that case be brought into power, and the government may then be made to conform to our views; and *this is the course I mean to pursue*, and that which I recommend to you."—The answer was "*you* may, but *I* will *never* pursue such a course." (See Statesman of August 9, 1824.) This communication was suffered to pass in silence. I do not remember that either the "Patriot," or Centinel, or National Journal, or any other Adams paper called on the Statesman or its correspondent for proof of this assertion. Surely a charge of so grave a nature, so confirmed by subsequent events, and undoubtedly susceptible of proof, required some extenuating notice from the conservators of the President's political reputation. Here are substantially the same sentiments, uttered at about the same time in New York, with those disclosed to Mr. Townsend in Massachusetts, and by the man who soon afterwards reduced these sentiments to practice! Of this corroborative testimony, I was utterly ignorant, till I saw the communication in the Statesman. See also the Statesman, Nov. 27, 1824.

If additional evidence is required to the mass already accumulated, to establish the facts contained in my affidavit, there are other witnesses to the declarations of Townsend, who are probably deterred from a public testimony by the conviction that speaking unwelcome truths in these days subjects the offender to relentless persecution. I could point out these persons, but I will not by publishing their names, bring upon them so great and certain an evil. Nor does the case require it; Townsend himself virtually confesses its truth, and I now proceed to produce his further testimony, not only as proving his declarations to myself, but (as I conceive) supporting and fortifying the positions of "one of the people."

I hold in my possession a paper that may not only aid the incredulous (if any such there are) in believing my affidavit, but perhaps open a new field in which their faith may expatiate. This evidence I omitted to publish in 1824, in consequence of the unexpected termination of that controversy. I withheld it in the expectation that a reply would be attempted to my last publication in the Statesman, and designed in a future communication to produce it, to the utter discomfiture of the enemy. No reply appeared and no opportunity has offered till the present, wherein I could publish it without seeming to intrude myself on the public. The paper came into my possession in the following manner:—A few days after the publication of Horatio Townsend's affidavit in the Patriot, (a copy of which I have inserted above) the *Justice of the Peace* by whom that affidavit was taken, voluntarily informed me of certain admissions made by Townsend, in his presence, at the time. I took down his information in writing, adopting his language as closely as I could recollect. The next morning I called at his office and presenting him the writing, requested him to erase every erroneous word, every sentence too strongly expressed, and to put it in a form that should give, *verbatim*, if possible, the admissions of Mr. Townsend. After reading it attentively he made several erasures, and inserted considerable new matter, and I now hold that paper, so corrected by him, nearly one half of which is in his writing. This gentleman is the learned editor of Yelverton's Reports and Starkie's Evidence, a distinguished jurist and accomplished scholar. I give a true copy of that paper, *the corrections* being printed in italics.

"Horatio Townsend told Alexander Townsend, at the time said A. visited Horatio for the purpose of procuring his affidavit, which afterwards appeared in the Patriot, that he did recollect having a conversation with John Q. Adams, the year previous to his secession from the federal party, that he (H. T.) had on reflection—"*doubted whether he ought not to have considered and treated the conversation as* CONFIDENTIAL, *though there was no such injunction or understanding at the time*; but what he had communicated gave color for the statements *which had been made respecting it.*"

To those who were acquainted with the late Horatio Townsend, it is unnecessary for me to make any comments on the above statement. *They* will readily understand that such admissions from a man of his remarkable pertinacity of temper and subtile mind, are equivalent to a full confession. To those who knew not the man, I suggest a few reflections. Townsend in the above statement admits that a conversation did take place between John Q. Adams and himself. When?—The year before Mr. Adams's political conversion. What was the purport of that conversation? He is silent respecting it, but discovers, after an interval of more than eighteen years, that it was of a nature to be considered and treated as a *confidential* conversation. Why? Have we not a right to infer because as an election of President was at hand, and John Q. Adams a candidate, a disclosure of that conversation would be injurious to his success?—Yet Townsend confesses that he had communicated that confidential conversation or a part of it—and for aught appears, to Mr. Richardson and myself, indeed he must have referred to the declarations in the Statesman. Was my report of that disclosure, was Mr. Richardson's recollection of the same erroneous? So far from it Townsend confesses that his communications authorized those statements.

If it be asked why, as a *federalist*, I am opposed to Mr. Adams, I answer, because federalism, (as I ever understood it,) inculcated pure republican principles, and honorable and consistent political conduct. Those of that party whom I have known from my youth, were generally men of exalted integrity, ardently devoted to the cause of the constitution and of rational liberty. Therefore I consider the calumnies vented upon them by Mr. Adams, at the time of his pretended conversion, to require of them as a sacred duty which they owe to themselves, to posterity, and to their country, a firm, united and undying opposition to all the aspirations of his ambition. Can such of that party as now rally in his support (and, alas! they are numerous) palliate the charge, that by so doing they confess the truth of his accusations and seal their own infamy?

Again, should it be asked (admitting Mr. Adams's political desertion to *be feigned*, and his declarations to Townsend, to disclose his true sentiments) why I come not to his aid in his de-

sign of restoring the federal party to power by *treacherously* effecting the ruin of their former adversaries'—I should think it fool scorn in any one to presume to suggest so base an action, and in the language of Evan Dhu, should reply "that he who could ask such a question, kens little of the heart" of a federalist, "or the honor of a gentleman."

JOHN B. DERBY.

Dedham, Mass. August 18th, 1828.

For the United States' Telegraph.

CIVIL CHIEFTAINS.

Mr. Clay, who seems to have glanced over the pages of ancient history for the purpose of satisfying *himself* that no man who has risked his life in defence of his country, is worthy of a civil trust—has taken care to study, in the same pages, the lessons taught in the school of *the Orators;* but without reflecting that the art of printing has enabled the people to "*weigh*" the principles, and the professions, and the actions of aspiring demagogues, he has not profited by the destiny of the *Orators*, whose vanity prompted them to treat the people as their property, which they could transfer to any master they might be pleased to serve.

Demosthenes seems to have been the model which Mr. Clay has endeavored to imitate—and he has chosen a sufficiently sordid example. Demosthenes took pay from both parties to a suit for debt due to the public treasury: Mr. Clay, on the floor of Congress, pronounced the Bank of the United States unconstitutional, and dangerous to the liberties of the country—yet he afterwards became the *hired* advocate and supporter of that Bank. Demosthenes wrote "an oration against his rival Æschines, *for betraying his trust as ambassador.*" Mr. Clay has caused a series of essays to be written and published against his rival, John Q. Adams, *for betraying his trust as an ambassador!* The points of similarity are strongly developed in many other respects—but it is unnecessary to cite them. Let the following example of the faith and honor of a "mere orator," suffice for the present.

Plutarch states that Æschines, envious and jealous of Demosthenes, impeached him publicly; but Demosthenes was honorably acquitted—whereupon, "Æschines immediately quitted Athens, and spent the rest of his days in teaching *Rhetoric* at Rhodes and in Ionia." The historian then proceeds:

"It was not long after this, that Harpalus came from Asia to Athens.* He had fled from the service of Alexander, both because he was conscious to himself of having falsified his trust, to minister to his pleasure, and because he dreaded his master, who was now become terrible to his best friends. As he applied to the people of Athens for shelter, and desired protection for his ships and treasures, most of *the Orators* [the WEBSTERS, &c.] had AN EYE UPON THE GOLD, and supported his application with *all their interest*. Demosthenes at first advised them to order Harpalus off immediately, and to be particularly careful not to involve the city in war again, without any just or necessary cause.

"Yet a few days after, when they were taking an account of the treasure, Harpalus perceiving that Demosthenes was much pleased with one of the *King's cups*, [a very "Safe Precedent!"] and stood admiring the workmanship and fashion, desired him to take it in his hand, *and feel the weight of the gold.*† Demosthenes being surprised at the WEIGHT, and asking Harpalus how much it might bring him, he smiled and said, "It will bring *you* twenty talents." And as soon as it was *night*, he sent him the cup, with that sum. For Harpalus knew well enough how to distinguish a man's passion for gold, by his pleasure at the sight, and the *keen looks he cast upon it.* Demosthenes could not resist the temptation; it made all the impression upon him that was expected; he received the money,

Those who have heard Mr. Clay tell the adventure of one of his colleagues at Ghent, with the handsome Flemish girl, understand who was intended to be designated in his letter to Mr. Blair, by the man "*with tears in his eyes,*" who urged him by a regard for his FUTURE INTEREST to vote for Mr. Adams. The hint was understood by the gentlemen who wrote to Mr. White, at the instance of Mr. Clay.

like a garrison, into his house, *and went over to the interests of Harpalus.* Next day, he came into the assembly with a quantity of WOOL and bandages about his neck; and when the people called upon him to get up and speak, he made signs that he had lost his voice. Upon which, some that were by said, "It was no common hoarseness [*quincy*] that he had got in the night; it was a hoarseness [*quincy*] occasioned by swallowing *gold and silver.*" Afterwards, when all the people were apprized of his *taking the bribe*, and he wanted to speak in his own defence, they would not suffer him, but raised a clamor, and expressed their indignation. At the same time, somebody or other [a KREMER or a fellow, no doubt,] stood up, and said, sneeringly, "*Will you not listen to the man with the cup?*" The Athenians then immediately sent Harpalus off; and fearing they might be called to account for the money with which *the Orators* had been corrupted, they made a strict inquiry after it, and searched all their houses except that of Callicles, the son of Arrenides; whom they

---

* Harpalus had the charge of Alexander's treasure in Babylon; and, flattering himself that he would never return from his Indian expedition, he gave in to all manner of crimes and excesses. At last, when he found that Alexander was really returning, and that he took a severe account of such people as himself, he thought proper to march off with 5,000 talents, and 6,000 men, into Attica.

† Mr. Clay said to Mr Floyd, (of Va.) pending the Presidential election in the House of Representatives—"When I take up the pretensions of Mr. Adams, and WEIGH them, and lay them down—then take up the pretensions of General Jackson, WEIGH them, and lay them down by the side of those of Mr. Adams—I never was as much puzzled in all my life, as I am to decide between them."—No doubt, if Mr. Adams' friend, "with tears in his eyes," had not cast the golden cup "safe precedent," into the scale with Mr. Adams' pretensions, the wishes of the people of Kentucky, and the other Western States, would have been gratified in the election of their favorite—Gen. Jackson.

Not a Woollens Bill

spared, as Theopompus says, because he was newly married, and his bride was in his house.

"At the same time, Demosthenes, SEEMINGLY with *a design to prove his innocence*, moved for an order, that the affair should be brought before the Court of Areopagus, [*Congress*] and all persons punished who should be found guilty of taking bribes. In consequence of which, he appeared before that Court, *and was one of the first that was convicted*. Being sentenced to pay a fine of fifty talents, and to be imprisoned till it was paid, the disgrace of his conviction, and the *weakness of his constitution*, which could not bear CLOSE CONFINEMENT, determined him to fly; and this he did, undiscovered by some and assisted by others. It is said, that when he was not far from the city, he perceived some of his late adversaries following, and endeavored to hide himself. But they called to him by name; and when they came nearer, desired him to take some necessary supplies of money, which they had brought with them for that purpose. They assured him they had no other design in following, and exhorted him to take courage. But Demosthenes gave in to more violent expressions of grief than ever, and said—"What comfort can I have, when I leave enemies in this city, more generous than it seems possible to find friends in any other?" He bore his exile in a *very weak* and *effeminate* manner. For the most part he resided in Ægina or Troezene; where, whenever he looked towards Attica, the *tears fell from his eyes*. In his expressions there was nothing of a *rational firmness*, nothing answerable to the *bold things* he had *said* and *done* in his administration. When he left Athens, we are told, he lifted up his hands towards the citadel, and said, "O, Minerva, goddess of these towers, whence is it that thou delightest in three such monsters as an owl, a dragon, and THE PEOPLE!" The young men who resorted to him for instruction, he advised, by no means, to meddle with affairs of state. He told them, "that if two roads had been shown him at first, the one leading to the *rostrum* and the business of the Assembly, and the other to certain destruction; and he could have foreseen the evils that awaited him in the *political walk*—the fears, the envy, the calumny, and contention—he would have chosen that road which led to immediate death."—*Pages 62-64, Plutarch's Lives, vol. 5. Printed at Worcester, Mass. by Isaiah Thomas, Jr. A. D. 1804.*

PHILO PLUTARCH.

From the Ithaca Journal.

MR. ADAMS AND MASONRY—AGAIN.

We have no desire to prolong this subject; but since the publication of the *Russell correspondence*, which was a mere *addenda* to that of Mr. Adams himself with *Oliver Heartwell*, we have received from Boston an *explanatory* letter, which places Mr. Adams' friend, Major Russell, in something of a *predicament*. We don't see how he is to *extricate* himself from it. The Major had declared, that he *saw Mr. Adams made a mason*. He afterwards said, that he was *mistaken*: it was *Josiah Quincy*, instead of *John Quincy Adams*, that he saw initiated. It *now* turns out, that *he did not see Josiah Quincy* initiated; and the fair inference is, that *it must be Mr. Adams!* But here is the letter, which we take the liberty of publishing, with the single remark, that upon the statements of Mr. Greene, our readers may place the most implicit reliance.

Boston, September 6, 1828.

E. MACK, Esq.

Dear Sir—I have seen in the Ithaca Journal of August 27, Major Russell's letter of the 9th, and mine of the 7th of August, together with your comments. I think a little explanation necessary to a right understanding of Major Russell's letter. I am not myself a Mason, and have no particular bias for or against the institution; but I am informed that a record is kept of every lodge meeting, of their proceedings; of the names of those entered, passed, and raised; and also of the names of the members and visiters present. Hence, if Mr. Adams were made a mason in St. John's Louge, it would appear on the records; and hence, perhaps, we may account for the absence of the records. Major Russell says, that "some time last spring, Mr. John Roberts, known by me to be a mason, called on me to enquire if I had any knowledge of Mr Adams' being a free mason, and I expressed my belief that he had been made one in St. John's or Massachusetts lodge, many years since, and that I was present at his initiation as a visiter." * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * "Having immediately made due inquiry, I found that Mr. Adams had never been made a mason, and was satisfied that the initiation I had seen, was that of Josiah Quincy, and that I had mistaken him for John Quincy Adams."

When there was no political effect to be produced, Major Russell's recollection was *distinct*, that he saw *John Quincy Adams* made a mason; and I am told by masons, that one would not be likely to make a mistake in this matter. He *now*, however, says, he did mistake; and that it was *Josiah Quincy* whom he saw initiated; so that it was doubtless one or the other of them he saw. Now, the records of the lodge are deficient for a number of years, about the time Major Russell thought he saw Mr. Adams made; so that we cannot get the *proof* to confront him with, on *this* point; but, fortunately, the records of *Josiah Quincy's* initiation *do* exist. He was made in St. John's lodge: and on examining the records, behold! Major Russell was NOT present, either as a *visiter* or *member*, or in any other capacity! I will leave it to you to draw the irresistable inference from these facts; and to the Adams men to explain the mysterious deficiency in the records of St. John's lodge.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

NATHANIEL GREENE.

☞ The only POTENTATES of the present age who rail against and persecute the Freemasons, a society whose foundation principles are *Philanthrophy* and *Charity*, are King Ferdinand of Spain, who sheds the blood of the Spanish Patriots, and *embroiders a petticoat* for the Image of the Virgin Mary, and King John 2nd of the U. States, who rides through the country on the Sabbath day in the disguise of a HORSE JOCKEY.—*Boston Statesman.*

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH....Extra.

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published, weekly until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more*

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 11, 1828. No. 31.

NASHVILLE COMMITTEE.

From the Nashville Republican.

TO THE PUBLIC.

A statement of the evidence of facts and inferences deducible therefrom, by the NASHVILLE COMMITTEE, *in refutation of a charge, in the public prints, imputing to Gen. Jackson a participation in the affair usually called Burr's Conspiracy.*

Nearly at the close of a contest for the Presidency, unparallelled in the number and atrocity of the calumnies heaped on one of the candidates, whose only offence is, to have met with much unbought favor and support from the great body of the citizens of these States, we see a last desperate effort made, to blight the honor of this man, and impair the just confidence reposed in his patriotism and integrity, by his countrymen. He is charged with the foul crime of treason; of having been connected with Aaron Burr in a conspiracy to sever the Union of these States.

Before we proceed with the evidence, in refutation of this unprincipled calumny, we will premise, that Gen. Jackson, while in the Senate of the United States, became well acquainted with Col. Burr; that then, and long after, Col. Burr stood high in the favor and estimation of the republican party in the United States; that he had acquired the good feelings of the West, by his great attention to its interests, and particularly of Tennessee, by his activity in procuring her admission into the Union; and that up to the month of November 1806, nothing like suspicion of treason, or of any project unfriendly to the peace or integrity of the United States, had any existence in this country; though Mr. Jefferson, in his message of January 22d, 1807, says—

"Some time in the latter part of *September I* received intimation that designs were in agitation in the western country, unlawful and unfriendly to the peace of the union, and that the prime mover in these was Aaron Burr, heretofore distinguished by the favor of his country. The grounds of these intimations being inconclusive, the objects uncertain, and the fidelity of that country known to be firm, the only measure taken was to urge the informants to use their best endeavors to get further insight into the designs and proceedings of the suspected persons and to communicate them to me."

And again he says:—

"The General's [Wilkinson's] letter which come to hand on the 25th November, as has been mentioned, and some other information received a few days earlier, when brought together, developed Burr's general designs, different parts of which only had been revealed to different informants. It appeared that he contemplated two distinct objects, which might be carried on either jointly or separately, and either the one or the other, first, as circumstances should direct. One of these was the separance of the union of these States by the Allegany mountains; the other an attack on Mexico. A third object was provided, merely ostensible, to wit, the settlement of a pretended purchase of a tract of country on the Washita, claimed by a Baron Bastrop. This was to serve as the pretext for all his preparations, an allurement for such followers as really wished to acquire settlements in that country, and a cover under which a retreat in the event of a final discomfiture of both branches of his real design.

"He found at once that the attachment of the Western Country to the present union was not to be shaken; that its dissolution could not be effected with the consent of its inhabitants, and that his resources were inadequate, as yet, to effect it by force. He took his course then at once, determined to seize on New-Orleans, plunder the bank there, possess himself of the military and naval stores, and proceed on his expedition to Mexico, and to this object all his means and preparations were now directed. He collected from all the quarters where himself or his agents possessed influence, all the ardent, restless, desperate, and disaffected persons who were ready for any enterprize analogous to their characters. He seduced good and well meaning citizens, some by assurances that he possessed the confidence of the government, and was acting under its secret patronage; a pretence which procured some credit, from the state of our differences with Spain, and others by offers of land in Bastrop's claim on the Washita.

"This was the state of my information of his proceedings, about the last of November; at which time, therefore, it was first possible to take specific measures to meet them.—The proclamation of November the 27th, two days after the receipt of Gen. Wilkinson's information, was now issued."

"Not apprized, till very late, that any boats were building on Cumberland, the effect of the proclamation had been trusted to for some time in the State of Tennessee; but on the 19th of December, similar communications and instructions, with those to the neighboring States, were despatched by express, to the governor, and a *general officer of the Western Division* of the State; and on the 23d of December, our confidential agent left Frankfort for Nashville, to put into activity, the means of that State also."

Although some might suspect Col. Burr to be engaged in schemes of pecuniary or personal aggrandizement, and might disapprove of them, and he might then have become a subject of suspicion to some extent, yet no one suspected them to be, in any degree, hostile to the government of the United States; and most persons in the West, believed that his designs were countenanced, and, in their execution, would be supported by the government. This idea was supported by the existing state of our relations with Spain, and the belief that a war with that power was impending—a war which, at that time, would have been popular in the Western States.

We will now introduce General Jackson's letter to George W. Campbell, then a representative in Congress from Tennessee, dated January 15th, 1807, not because it is first in date of the several documents we shall present, but because it contains a connected and continuous relation of Gen. Jackson's knowledge and conduct, with regard to Col. Burr; a plain and manly narrative, containing in itself a vindication, which must prove satisfactory and conclusive to every honest and well constituted mind; from which sophistry and incredulity will alike shrink back, foiled and overcome; and which, when supported in all material points, by other direct evidence, which shall be given, must carry conviction to the most prejudiced of his foes.

Copy of a letter from Andrew Jackson to G. W. Campbell, January 15th, 1807.

"Sir:—The late denunciation of Aaron Burr, as a traitor, has excited great surprise, and general indignation. Still, from the opinion possessed of the accuser, many there are who wait for the proof, before they will pronounce him guilty of the charge. One thing is generally believed, that if Burr is guilty, Wilkinson has participated in the treason. The public mind has been much agitated from various reports, of Burr having been met at the mouth of Cumberland river, with 100 boats and 1000 armed men; and it was stated as a fact, that the Captain at Massac and all the men were going with him. Subsequent reports stated they had gone. An express which I started on the receipt of the Secretary of War's letter of the — ult. has returned, and states that Burr left Massac on the 3d ult. in company ten boats, six men on board each, without arms, or any thing that can afford suspicion; and that Capt. Bissell has been doing his duty as a vigilant officer. I had ordered out 12 companies of volunteers on the receipt of the Secretary of War's letter to check the adventurers, which on return of express I dismissed. I have no doubt but from the pains that have been taken to circulate reports, it will be rumored that I am on full march to unite with Burr. This I know you never will believe until you hear it from myself; or from such a source that you know cannot err. Should you ever hear that I am embarked in a cause, inimical to my country, believe it not. Should you hear that treasonable intentions have come to my knowledge, and that I have been silent, believe them not; or that I would not put any man out of existence, who would name such a thing to me, without on the ground of discovering it to the proper authorities. If Burr has any treasonable intentions in view, he is the basest of all human beings:—I will tell you why. He always held out the idea of settling Washita, unless a war with Spain, in that event, he held out the idea that from his intimacy with the Secretary of War, he would obtain an appointment, and if he did, would revolutionize Mexico. About the 10th of November, Captain ——— called at my house, and after the stay of a night, and part of a day introduced the subject of the adventurers and in part stated, that their intention was to divide the Union. I sternly asked how they would effect it, he replied by seizing New Orleans and the Bank, shutting the port, conquering Mexico, and uniting the western parts of the Union to the conquered country. I, perhaps with warmth asked him how this was to be effected; he replied, by the aid of the federal troops, and the general at their head. I asked if he had this from the General, he said he had not. I asked him if Col. Burr was in the scheme; he answered he did not know, nor was he informed that he was —that he barely knew Col. Burr, and never had any conversation with him. I asked him how he knew this, and from whom he got his information; he said from —— in New York. Knowing that Col. Burr was well acquainted with——it rushed into my mind like lightning, that he, (Burr,) was at the head, and from the colorings he had held out to me, Generals Robertson and Overton, and the hospitality I had shown him, I viewed it as base conduct to us all, and heightened the baseness of his intended crimes, if he really was about to become a traitor. I sat down and wrote to General Smith and Doctor Dickson; I wrote to Governor Claiborne to put his citadel in a state of defence, without naming any person except Gen. Wilkinson. When this was done, I wrote Col Burr in strong terms, my suspicions of him and until they were cleared from my mind, no further intimacy was to exist between us. I made my suspicions known to Generals Robertson and Tatum, with some others. Not long after, I received his answer, with the most sacred pledges that he had not, nor never had, any views inimical or hostile to the United States, and whenever he was charged with the intention of separating the Union, the idea of insanity must be ascribed to him. After his acquittal in Kentucky, he returned to this country, and to all who named the subject, made the same pledge, and said that he had no objects in view, but such as were sanctioned by legal authority; and still said, that when necessary, he would produce the Secretary of War's orders—that he wanted only young men of talents to go with him, with such he wished to make his settlement, as it would have a tendency to draw to it wealth and character. For these reasons—from the pledges made, if he is a traitor, he is the basest that ever did commit treason, and being torn to pieces, and scattered to the 4 winds of Heaven, would be too good for him. But we will leave him for time and evidence to verify his hue. I have given you the outlines, and in a few weeks will give the proof,

A. JACKSON.

"It is hereby certified that the original letter here referred to, was submitted to Mr. Jefferson, then President of the United States, immediately after it was received, from which, after perusing it, he desired permission to copy such parts as related to the affair of Burr, being the same contained in the foregoing extracts, which was freely given, and when the letter was returned to the undersigned, he understood from Mr. Jefferson he had taken a copy as he proposed doing; and those parts of which the foregoing is a copy, being all that related to said affair, were underscored while in his possession.

"G. W. CAMPBELL.

April the 3d 1823."

This letter was shown, immediately on its receipt to Mr. Jefferson, and by him copied. From this we see the reason why Burr's name

was not mentioned in the letter of the 12th Nov. 1806, to Claiborne; the information obtained by Jackson extended only to the commander of the U. S. troops; the connexion of Burr with him, was a mere conjecture of his own; therefore it is also, that in the letters of Gen. Smith and Dr. Dickson, Senator and Representative in Congress, he speaks of his apprehensions of an attempt to sever the Union, and with reference to Burr, in separate paragraphs.

Every act and sentiment of Gen. Jackson's life is marked with the deepest horror of any opinions, or acts, or persons, favoring a severance of the States; and upon this subject he always has displayed a more than ordinary sensibility; no wonder then, that he may before Judge Williams and others, have expressed, in strong language, his apprehensions in relation to it, when he was communicating every week the same fears and anxieties to the general government through our members of Congress. But no man, not even Judge Williams, who will be disposed of presently, has ever dared to testify that Jackson ever expressed approbation of such designs, or that he ever expressed any other sentiment than that which he announced, emphatically, to Gov. Claiborne—"I will die in the last ditch before I would yield a foot *to the Dons* or see the *Union disunited*."* A heroic and sublime annunciation, which subsequent events have stamped with the seal of unquestionable verity, and proved to be no vain flourish; and that whether the enemy of his country was the Don, the Savage, or the Briton, his life was always ready to be offered up as a willing sacrifice for her safety and glory.

We now give extracts from Jackson's letters to Gen. Smith and Doctor Dickson, dated November 17th and 27th, 1806.

Extract of a letter from Gen. Jackson to the Hon. Daniel Smith, Senator in Congress.

HERMITAGE, Nov. 17, 1806.

Dear Sir: By the last mail I wrote you lengthily upon a subject on which I have heard nothing since. My mind is still as firmly fixed in the belief as it possibly can be in a thing of which it has not positive proof, however, circumstances may arise that may bury the project in oblivion.

I have nothing new since I wrote you last.—Report says Col. Burr has been arrested in Frankfort, Kentucky, on a charge for raising men to invade Mexico; whether this is the fact I cannot say, but from the channel through which the report has come, I believe it true that he has been arrested.

Extract of a letter from the same to Dr. William Dickson, Representative in Congress, dated Nov. 17, 1806.

Since my last, I have heard nothing more on the subject I wrote Gen. Smith; but my mind is as firmly of the belief that the project was in view, as it can be without positive proof; circumstances may arise, though, which may put an end to it altogether.

Report says Col. Burr has been arrested on a warrant, issued from the Federal Court of Kentucky, on a charge of raising men to invade Mexico. Whether this is true or not I cannot say—it appears to be pretty authentic.

From the same, to the Hon. Daniel Smith, Senator in Congress.

NASHVILLE, Nov. 27th, '06.

Dear General: I have nothing since my last, to inform you—nothing either to confirm or lessen my suspicions on the subject named in my first letter to you. A little time will give us room to form a more conclusive opinion on the subject and points therein alluded to.

These letters show that about the 12th of November,† as stated in his letter to Mr. Campbell, General Jackson had written to Smith and Dickson detailing such information as he possessed. The letters of the 12th to those gentlemen cannot be found, altho' the executors of both (both being dead) have made diligent search for them, and General Jackson retained no copies.‡

In further support of the facts as stated in Gen. Jackson's letter to Mr. Campbell, we shall append and refer to the letters of General Robertson to General Smith, dated Dec. 23d, 1806, and February, 1807, and the letter of Judge Stewart, (then district attorney for the United States) to Gen. Smith of January 8th, 1807, and the statement of Dr. Felix Robertson.§

We now introduce the testimony of General Coffee and Col. Ward, completely explanatory of all the circumstances connected with building boats for Col. Burr; the ostensible designs and objects held out by him, the reasons of his favorable reception in Tennessee by Gen. Jackson, Gen. Robertson and many other distinguished persons of the country; the origin and extent of the suspicions as to his objects; his last visit to the Clover bottom, near Gen. Jackson's, in December, 1806, his reception, &c.‖

"NASHVILLE, Aug. 28, 1823.

"By request of the Nashville Committee, I do hereby state, that Col. Burr, when in Tennessee in 1805 and 6, represented his views to be the settlement of lands to the south, on the Washita river. He spoke of the probability of a rupture between the United States and Spain, in which event, the impression was, that he (Col. Burr) would have command of an expe-

* See Gen. Jackson's letter to Governor Claiborne under date Nov. 12th, 1806.

† Certainly on this day, as will appear by Gen. Jackson's letter to O. W. Campbell, Esq. of that date in which he says "I sat down and wrote to Gen. Smith and Dr. Dickson" &c. &c.

‡ Probably handed to Mr. Jefferson and by him retained.

§ See appendix from one to four inclusive.

‖ With a view to show the state of public opinion in this State with regard to Col. Burr, about this time, the following article is copied from the Impartial Review, a paper printed in Nashville, dated Oct. 4th 1806.

"Col. Aaron Burr, the steady and firm friend of the State of Tennessee arrived in this place on Friday 28th ult. and on the next day, a dinner was given him at Talbot's Hotel, at which were convened many of the most respectable citizens of Nashville and its vicinity. There appeared an union of sentiment on this occasion; many appropriate toasts were drank, and a few of the most suitable songs given, when the company retired quite gratified."

nation against Mexico, under and by the authority of the United States. Sometime after he had been in Tennessee in 1805, and left this impression, letters were received from him, as my impressions now are, by Gens. Jackson and Robertson, requesting them to make out and forward to him a list of such enterprising young men, as it was believed would serve the country well in the impending anticipated contest with Spain. Gen's Robertson and Jackson, with sundry others of the old respectable citizens, did, for that purpose meet in Nashville, and made out such list and as I supposed sent it on to him. Colonel Burr's then standing in the western country (having lately filled the second office in the government,) forbade the idea that his contemplated measures were apart from the knowledge and approbation of the government.—On his arrival here, and for some time after, marked attentions were by him extended to him; and no suspicions were entertained that his plans and views were at all different—from what they were represented by himself. With a view to the building of some boats, and procuring some provisions, there had been remitted to Gen. Jackson the sum of three thousand and five dollars, which was placed in my hands, with a desire expressed that I would attend to the request made by Col. Burr.

"This agency I accepted and performed, and made arrangements, for purchasing some provisions, and the building by different persons of five flat boats, and the purchase of one keel boat. Subsequently, a further sum of five hundred dollars was put into my hands.

"Part of the funds, to wit, seven hundred dollars, as appears by reference to the memorandum of the expenditure, was paid over to Col. William P. Anderson; wherefore, and for what account, this advance to Col. Anderson was made, I have not now a sufficient recollection to speak with certainty. Suspicions having subsequently arisen, relative to the real objects and views of Col. Burr, my agency in his affairs ceased, except to discharge the contracts that had previously been entered into. The balance of the remaining funds in my hands was paid over to Col. Burr on his arrival in Tennessee on the last visit he made here, in the month of December 1806. I was at that time engaged in mercantile business, and these services were performed by me for Colonel Burr, as they would have been rendered to any respectable man, for I, nor any one else, that came to my knowledge, believed that he had objects to serve, other than were represented by himself.

"The particulars here detailed, are founded on papers now in my possession, written at the time, and in my own hand writing.—In the month of December, 1806, Col. Burr returned to Tennessee, where he was met coolly by those who before had acted differently towards him. He perceived it, and remarked it to me; my reply to him in substance was, that suspicions rested against him, and until they were removed, nothing different was to be expected.

"At the Clover Bottom, nine miles from Nashville, where I then did business, and which was the nearest point on the river to where his boats were, there was a tavern, and to this place Col. Burr came and remained about a week, until he had gotten every thing in readiness for his departure down the river. On his first arrival in Tennessee, on his last visit in December, General Jackson was absent from home; having returned within a few days afterwards, the General came in company with General Overton, to the Clover Bottom, where Col. Burr resided. An interview took place between them and Col. Burr, at which they informed him of the suspicions and distrust, that were entertained against him. Burr repelled them, and expressed deep regret that there should be any such, and remarked that he could, and would be able to satisfy every dispassionate mind, that his views and objects were friendly to the Government, and such as he had represented them to be. In a few days after, he left the country.

"A son of Colonel Hays, about seventeen years of age, as has been represented, nephew to Mrs. Jackson, went along. His father had become reduced in his circumstances; had been personally known to Col. Burr, during the Revolution, and his son a young man of promise, it had been proposed to the old gentleman, that he should take him and aid him in his education, which was consented to by his father.—General Jackson gave him letters to Governor Claiborne, and instructed young Mr. Hays, as I understood at the time, that should he discover Col Burr's views to be at all inimical to the United States, or adverse to the designs of Government, to leave him and place himself under the protection and care of Governor Claiborne.

"Between General Jackson and myself, there has always existed confidence and friendship; and there was nothing ever perceived in him by me, that could in lace the belief that there was any man in the country who would go further, and make greater sacrifices, to defend and maintain the integrity of the Union;—on all occasions his conduct and declarations have stamped upon my mind this conviction.

JOHN COFFEE.

"At the request of the Chairman of the Nashville Committee, I make the following statement. That Gen. Thomas Overton deceased, informed me within a few days after the occurrence, that so soon as the rumor reached this country, that Col. Aaron Burr had treasonable designs against our government, he, (General Overton) and General A. Jackson waited on Col. Burr, who was then I think at Clover Bottom, and informed him of the rumor, and required of him to state to them what were his views or designs. This answer was made, as he said, on the honor of a gentleman: "That he had no views inimical to the Government—none but what were known to the Government and viewed with complaisance." And as well as my memory serves me, showed them a commission in blank, with Mr. Jefferson's signature to it. EDWARD WARD.

Nashville, Sept 20, 1828.

This testimony requires no commentary; it is full and decisive.

To show what views were expressed by Col. Burr to Gen. Jackson and others, so early as the spring of 1806, and to explain beyond the reach of cavil and dispute, the time, nature and import of any *possible* conversation which Gen. Jackson may have held with Judge Williams, in relation to a commission, connected with any designs or views of Col. Burr, we give ex

tracts from a letter written by him to Gen. Jackson, dated 24th March, 1806, Washington city.

After speaking of some general political subjects, and of the strong probability of a rupture with Spain—"If these apprehensions (says he) should be justified by events, a military force on our part would be requsite, and that force might come from your side of the mountains. It is presumed that West Tennessee could not spare more than two regiments." "I take the liberty of recommending to you to make out a list of officers, from Colonel down to Ensign, for one or two regiments." "If you will transmit to me this list, I will in case troops should *be called for, recommend it to the Department of War*, and I have reason to believe, that on such an occasion, my advice would be listened to." Gen. Coffee says, "that in consequence of letters, from Col. Burr to Gen. Robertson and others of *similar import*, a meeting was held in Nashville by Gen. Robertson, General Jackson, and others of the most respectable men, and a list made out of such enterprising young men as it was believed, would serve the country well, in the impending contest with Spain."

This brings us naturally to the consideration of Judge Williams' statements—and here we cannot forbear for one moment, to remark, on the danger, the folly, and the wickedness of attempting to bereave a man of his fame, and charge upon him one of the foulest crimes known to the law, upon loose, vague recollections of a casual conversation, said to have taken place upwards of twenty years ago, without any statement of the conversation in context with it; without any date, except with reference to a range of nine months of time; without any relation of the circumstances which led to an insulated remark, so strange and incredible, if taken in the sense attempted to be attached to it by Judge Williams and many of the administration prints; statements made by a man who, by his own admissions, his own showing, and yet more, *by what we shall show*, is subject to the most inaccurate recollection: when the change or omission, or addition of a single word, or the nature of the preceding or succeeding remarks, would entirely change the whole meaning and sense of what is stated to have been said.

That ample justice may be done to Judge Williams' mind, consistency, and conduct, we now republish all that he has written or published in relation to this conversation and to Gen. Jackson,* and also what has been published to be the substance of the letter written by him to his friend in Virginia, as a copy of that letter has been, as we understand, called for, and withheld from publication.

Taking the whole of these documents, we have some data from which to estimate correctly, how far the clearness of Judge Wiliams' mind, and the impartiality of his feelings, qualify him for deposing accurately and fairly. We will look at them, first, with a view to the question, how much reliance is to be reposed in the accuracy and fairness of his statements and memory; and then, in prosecution of the same inquiry, produce some additional evidence. Secondly;—we shall shew the extreme improbability, from Williams' own statement, that Gen. Jackson ever could have made any propositions to him, in reference to any illegal or treasonable project; and lastly, the fallacy of the inferences which his pretended friends, attempt to deduce from what he has said: and show what Judge Williams has really stated as Gen. Jackson's conversation with him, and what the conversation (if, indeed, there ever was one of any such nature) related to.

In his letter to Mr. Kerr* Judge Williams says, the conversation occurred upon his examination by Gen. Jackson, then a Judge, as to his fitness to receive a license to practise law; but when he discovered by the records of the State,† that it would be proved, General Jackson was not, and had not, been a Judge for several years before this time, the conversation is divested of this circumstance in his subsequent statements. In the letter to Mr. Kerr, Judge Stewart is said to have heard this conversation as to the offer of a commission; but when Judge Stewart not only does not recollect any such conversation, but is sure none such was held in his presence;‡ the scene of the conversation is then recollected by Judge Williams to have been a solitary ride from Gen. Jackson's to Nashville. In his letter to Gen. Jackson, Williams says, "Gen. Jackson, in reference to that conspiracy, or what *was afterwards* called by *others*, a conspiracy, said to me, that I could, if I would accept it, obtain a commission of captain." In his last statement made, and published in the Knoxville Enquirer of August 6th 1828, he says, "in riding from Gen. Jackson's house to Nashville, near the Clover-bottom, he spoke to me in relation to a commission in Burr's army," leaving out the material idea of a reference to what was afterwards as he says, called a conspiracy; shewing thereby, that in these statements, Judge Williams does not pretend to detail with accuracy, the *words* or *terms* used in the conversation, but only the general impressions, and that those *impressions* are indefinite and *very vague*, and are the mere floating and broken reminiscences of a feeble and shattered memory.—Judge Williams says, that from the *best of his recollection*, Mr. Smith, Mr. Curry and Dr. Watkins, among others, were present when Burr's effigy was burnt. Mr. Smith says he was not present either at the ball or at the burning of the effigy. Mr. Curry§ says that he was not present at the ceremony of burning Col. Burr in effigy, and considered it a disgraceful act; and he also says in further confirmation of Judge Williams' feebleness of memory, and the probable recentness of his present impressions, that "Mr. Williams called on me frequently after Burr became an object of suspicion, and conversed freely on the subject, and as I then thought, withheld nothing; yet he never told me that Gen. Jackson wanted to enlist him to fight Spaniards, nor ever mentioned his

---

*See appendix from No. 5 to 9 inclusive.

*See Appendix No. 5.

†See Journals of the State Legislature, at the July Session 1803, heretofore published in the Richmond Enquirer.

‡See Judge Stewart's letter dated March 1st 1828, lately published in the Journals of the day.

§See appendix Nos 10 and 11

[illegible] as connected with, or knowing to any of Burr's schemes.† These and other contradictions and discrepancies, referred to in the appendix, are mentioned not to shew any wilful or corrupt mis-statement on the part of Judge Williams, (how far they may tend to that point we leave others to infer) but to shew how little credence or trust can be placed on the recollections (even if stated in the utmost good faith) of a memory, mistaken in so many circumstances, and persons, and things, when it comes to detail a conversation, in which a single word would wholly transform its meaning and construction. But to dispose of Judge Williams at once, and to shew what degree of confidence is due to what he may relate, either as to facts or the conversations of others—whether this want of confidence arise from great *unsoundness of memory*, or other cause—and also to show how far Judge Williams' feelings as to General Jackson, entitle him to the character of a cool and impartial witness; and also in still further elucidation of Judge Williams' candour and consistency; and to show how far his declarations in his letter, that "General Jackson may be assured (*the Presidential question aside*) no man can *feel more bound to Gen. Jackson* than myself, for the great honor conferred by him on my country"—*was a true representation of what he did feel;* we call the attention of every American citizen to the following extract of a publication of Judge Williams, dated "McMinnville, June 28th, 1828.

"State also, if you please, Mr. Editor, that in the town of M'Minnville, there lives a man by the name of Theoderic Burton—a man of truth and respectability, as I have heard here—he states that in 1805, *he was one of Burr's men*, and was mustered into service at the Clover Bottom, with arms in their hands—that about seventy-five men signed the list of enrolment at the same time with himself—that at that time Gen. Jackson and Aaron Burr, were on the ground, and that Patton Anderson was his Captain. Burton says, when the men under Anderson seperated, it was under an agreement, as to the time when they were to march off with Burr, as his men—and that before that time came round, the matter bursted. This is a condensed view of what Mr. Burton says: who refuses to give a written statement. Now, when Gen. Jackson was summoned as a witness to Richmond against Burr, if he had called on Burton as another witness, the Government would have been enabled to have proved an overt act of treason on Burr. Treason when connected with Gen. Eaton's and Commodore Truxton's Evidence.—Why, let me ask, did he fail to do so? When I recollect, that the destruction of the American Institutions was the object of the Burr Conspiracy, and that Gen. Jackson was in the possession of facts and circumstances which would have convicted the Conspirators, and yet improperly withheld them, when summoned to Richmond to give testimony, thereby enabling them to escape from punishment, I am filled with astonishment, that the American Nation should think for a moment, of supporting his pretensions to the highest office in the gift of the people.—In view of this state of things, I tremble for my country's honor and safety.

"If Mr. Jefferson invested as he was with such political power and authority, had been as friendly to Burr's schemes as Jackson is believed to have been, it is impossible for the mind of man to conceive, the disasters that would have threatened the safety of this Union.

NATH. W. WILLIAMS."

Compare this statement with that of Mr Burton, the gentleman referred to in the above remarks of Judge Williams, as "a man of *truth and respectability,*" which is as follows:

"*To the Editors of the Republican.*

GENTLEMEN:—In as much as Nathaniel W. Williams, in a late newspaper publication, has taken the liberty to advert to my name, and to give me as authority for facts in relation to Gen. Jackson and Col. Burr, which I never stated to him, or any one else, and which in truth I never heard of before; it is due to my character, humble as it may be, and to Gen Jackson, the destruction of whose private and honest reputation he seeks, to declare to the world that I was never mustered into Col. Burr's service, at the Clover Bottom, or any where else, nor did I ever so state to Judge Williams.

When Col. Burr, was in this country, many years ago, (the particular year or season of the year, is not now within my recollection,) I resided with Maj. Tilman Dickson, Patton Anderson passed through the neighborhood and was engaged in recruiting a company, as he said, for the purpose of making a settlement in the Washita country. Being a young man, I was prevailed on by Maj. Dickson and Patton Anderson, to join the company, and did actually enroll myself under Anderson. I know not how many men were engaged besides myself, nor do I remember any one of my acquaintances or neighbors, who did join the company. Here, however, the matter ended. I was never mustered into service at the Clover Bottom, nor did I ever receive any arms, as I am made to say most untruly by Judge Williams, to whom I declare I never made so unfounded an assertion; nor did I ever see any military parade of any company of persons, whatever, at the Clover Bottom, or any where else, at the time referred to and as stated by the Judge.

"I remember once to have seen General Jackson and Col. Burr at a race over the Clover Bottom turf; but so far from suspecting that they were concerting any schemes against the country, I saw no apparent intimacy between them.

"So far from wishing, or intending from any thing and every thing I know on the subject of Col. Burr and his alleged conspiracy, or in any conversation with Judge Williams, to condemn General Jackson, or to connect his name with any scheme, unfriendly to the Government, I wish to be understood as declaring to the world that I believe him to be an injured patriot, in many things—in nothing more cruelly, than in the attempt to make him a conspirator.

"It is right and proper to add, that when Judge Williams heard of my complaints, occasioned by his unauthorized use of my name, he wished to avoid the censure that awaited him, by begging me not to give this statement, but to leave to him to exhonerate himself, by correcting his publications. I leave the world to form their opinions of such conduct. For myself I must request my name from the list of

† See appendix No. 11.

General Jackson's relentless and cruel persecutors. THEODERICK BURTON.

M'Minnville, Warren, county, Tenn. Sept. 6, '28.

After this comparison, and after the concluding remarks and facts exhibited in Mr. Burton's letter, we might securely consign Judge Williams, his mind, his memory, his accuracy, and his credit, to be estimated as the people may think meet and proper.

But we now submit to the good sense of all reflecting men, the extreme improbability, that under the circumstances related by Judge Williams, any treasonable or illegal proposition, could have been made to him by Gen. Jackson; a proposition, pregnant with the most fearful and dangerous consequences to the projector; made without any previous ascertainment of the man's views or feelings to whom it was addressed; without any promise or even request of secrecy or concealment; without explanation or developement of the means to be employed, or the objects to be attained; made in a casual and careless conversation, made to a young man of much less than mediocrity of intellect, and who had nothing to bring in aid of such a high and dangerous enterprize, but want of talent and want of prudence—contains a series of improbabilities, which amount to absolute certainty, and which the most credulous and prejudiced, we believe, must reject.

But when we come to examine what Judge Williams relates of this conversation, we find that if any such over did occur, it must naturally and necessarily be referred to the legal, fair and publicly avowed views of Col. Burr; to the two regiments spoken of in his letters to Gen. Jackson, Gen. Robertson and others, to be organized and commissioned by the government; to the force and arms to be employed by the United States, in the anticipated war with Spain, to the list of young men spoken of in Col Burr's letters, and which was to be laid before the Secretary of War, in short, to the armed force, at the head of which, Col. Burr held out the belief, he was to be placed by government, in the event of a war with Spain. Judge Williams does not pretend that Gen. Jackson disclosed to him, any treasonable or illegal projects; does not pretend that the offer spoken of, was preceded by any conversation or communications by Gen. Jackson or any traitorous or illegal conspiracy, against the peace or integrity of the United States. If such communications had been made to Judge Williams, and he had failed to reveal them instantly to the proper authorities, he would stand an infamous and avowed traitor in heart, and unworthy the confidence of any honest man or true citizen. But he does not say any such plans or plots were communicated to him; in justice of Judge Williams, and in conformity with truth, we must say, none such ever were.

In his letter to Gen. Jackson of February 27th, 1828,* Williams says, "some time before Jefferson's proclamation, in riding from Gen. Jackson's house to Nashville, General Jackson, *in reference to that conspiracy*, or *what was afterwards called by others a conspiracy*, said to me, "that I could, if I would accept it, obtain a commission of Captain." This is the only one of Judge Williams' several statements, in which he uses any term even *implying* wrong or illegality; the word *conspiracy*, and the only words attributed to Gen. Jackson are, "Gen. Jackson said to me, "I could, if I would accept it, obtain a commission of Captain." He says that this was said by Gen. Jackson in *reference* to that conspiracy. What conspiracy? Did it refer to any previous conversation developing a conspiracy? Judge Williams does not say so. No state of facts then existed, even in *his* mind, to which the term *conspiracy* was by *him then* attached; but it was what was *afterwards by others*, called so.† This is not left to reasoning, however conclusive and satisfactory that may be, for in his subsequent and mature statement, published, as he avows, from a *sense of duty*, he says, "in riding from Gen. Jackson's house to Nashville, near the Clover-Bottom, he spoke to me in relation to a commission in Burr's army," and this was some time in the spring or fall of 1806. Here the offer and conversation is in reference to "Burr's army;"—what army, and for what objects? Beyond all question, the army spoken of by Burr, in his letter to Gen. Jackson of March 1806; the officers to be *commissioned* by the Secretary at War, and to be employed against Spain.‡ We now dismiss Judge Williams.

---

* See Appendix, No 5

† See Judge William's genuine letter to Gen. Jackson, published originally in the Richmond Enquirer, and varying from that published in the Knoxville Enquirer.

‡ See the statement of the Hon. Willis Alston, M. C. under date Feb. 11th, 1828, in the Appendix, No. 13, in which Gen. Jackson is reported to have "asked of Mr. Jefferson (then President of the U. S.) the views of the government, tendering his services if wanted, to make a descent upon Mexico, as stated by Burr—but if Burr was not authorized by the government to carry on his enterprise as stated, then he (Jackson) was ready to arrest him." See also the President's message of January 22d, 1807, in which he says—"He (Burr) seduced good and well meaning citizens, some by assurances that he possessed the confidence of the government, and was acting under its secret patronage; a pretence which procured some credit, from our differences with Spain; and others by offers of land in Bastrop's claim on the Washita." The above conversation of Mr. J. with Mr. Alston, is presumed to have taken place, when the supposed conspiracy was on the tapis, during the Presidency of Mr. Jefferson. Again; Doct. Watkins details a similar conversation; he says in his letter of August 16th, published on the 27th in the Knoxville Register—"in a conversation with Mr. Jefferson in his chamber, when convalescent from a dangerous spell of sickness, in which I attended him in the autumn of 1819, I remarked that some had expressed *doubts* of the conduct of Gen. Jackson, in relation to Col. Burr's affair. Mr. Jefferson most promptly and explicitly replied, in as nearly as I can recollect, these express words, "you may depend upon it, Sir, that I have the most satisfactory evidence, that on that occasion, Gen. Jackson was vigilant, faithful, and patriotic."

See also Gen. J's letter to Mr. Jefferson, received by him on the 24th November, 1806, published in the Virginia Advocate August 2[illegible]

in Explanation of Col. S. B. Hays' descend-
g to Natchez with Col. Burr, we submit the
tements of General Coffee and Col. Hays
nself,§ which are not only satisfactory, we
ink, as to that matter, but also throw addi-
nal light in showing the strict propriety and
rrectness of all Gen. Jackson's acts and inten-
ns towards Col. Burr.

In conclusion, we shall briefly recapitulate
e most material facts and circumstances, prov-
by the foregoing testimony 1st. That Gen.
ckson only received and treated Col. Burr as
enerous and hospitable gentleman would re-
ve and treat a guest and acquaintance, who
n, and long had held a distinguished rank as
tatesman and man of talents, in the estima-
n of the great Republican party in the United
tes; who had recently held the second office
the government; and with whom the honora-
and the good might associate without re-
ach, and as a man, in Mr. Jefferson's lan-
ge, "heretofore distinguished by the favour
is country."

2. That Gen. Jackson communicated to the
vernment and its officers, fully and explicitly,
con as he had information of any kind.

3. That Col. Burr never did communicate to
n. Jackson any designs treasonable or hostile
the government of the United States; but al-
's avowed designs consistent with its into-
, and averred by him to be supported by
countenance and authority

4. That the first public suspicions, as to the
ality of Col. Burr's projects, were allayed,
to a great degree destroyed, by the investi-
ons in Kentucky in the beginning of Decem-
1806, by the finding of the grand jury,
ch was evidently calculated to have this ef-
, and which effect is proven by Mr. Jeffer-
's message of January 22d, 1807, to have
n produced, where he says, "In Kentucky,
premature attempt to bring Burr to justice
hout sufficient evidence for his conviction,
produced a popular impression in his favor,
a general disbelief of his guilt."‖

§ See Appendix, No. 14, and Gen. Coffee's
ement.

(FRANKFORT, Dec. 5th, 1806.

OL. BURR.—The Grand Jury are happy to
rm the Court, that no violent disturbance of
public tranquillity, or breach of the laws,
come to their knowledge.

We have no hesitation in declaring, that
ng carefully examined and scrutinized all
testimony which has come before us, as well
the charges against Aaron Burr, as those
ained in the indictment preferred to us
nst John Adair; that there has been no tes-
ny before us, which does in the smallest de-
e criminate the conduct of either of those
sons; nor can we, from all the inquiries and
stigations of the subject, discover that any
g improper or injurious to the interest of
government of the United States, or contra-
o the laws thereof, is designed or contem-
ed by either of them.—[*From the Impartial
iew of Dec. 13th*, 1806.

From the Frankfort (Ky.) Palladium.
published in the Impartial Review, Novem-
ber 29th, 1806—Nashville.)

On Wednesday, the 5th inst. when it was
ently reported and generally believed in

5. That after suspicions had been excited against Col. Burr, or after the letters to Governor Claiborne, Gen. Smith, and Doctor Dickson, Col. Burr never was invited to Gen. Jackson's house; but that when in the state of Tennessee, in the month of Dec. 1806, he remained not at Gen. Jackson's, but at a tavern at the Clover-bottom, several miles distant, near which his boats were; that he was received with a marked change of manners and coldness by Jackson, and others; that an interview with Burr was sought by Jackson, and had in the presence of several gentlemen, when Burr most solemnly avowed his innocence, and disavowed all objects hostile to the union or government; and that the President's proclamation was not received at Nashville until the 27th December, 1806, five days after Colonel Burr's departure, with only two boats.*

6. That from the unhappy inaccuracy of Judge Williams' memory and recollections, no reliance can be placed on his statements: but that if any such reliance could be given, it is shown that the offer and conversation he speaks of, related above to the public, well known, and legal objects held out and spoken of by Col. Burr.

We do not feel perfectly sure, that in the course we have pursued, we shall not be considered by some, as manifesting a want of pru-

——

this place, that Col. Burr had left Lexington, Joseph H. Davies, Attorney for the United States for this District, appeared in Court, and after some preliminary observations, calculated to excite great expectation, read the affidavit which appears in this paper, and moved the Court for a capias against Col. Burr, and for compulsory process to compel the attendance of witnesses."

* * * * * * *

"These events having circulated rapidly throughout the country, and generally mingled with error and exaggeration, excited great solicitude and expectation. On Wednesday morning, (yesterday, 12th inst.) this town was crowded with persons from all quarters, beyond any former example; all was eagerness and impatience. The witnesses who had been summoned, attended without an exception—the Court was opened, the Grand Jury was called, and appeared; just as the Judge was expected to deliver his charge, Mr. Davies rose, and moved that the Grand Jury might be dismissed, declaring that he was not prepared to proceed with the inquiry, by reason of the absence of a witness, whom he deemed material. The disappointment and chagrin of a crowded audience may be conceived, but the ridicule and laughter which followed, was universal. The *public sentiment which had all along been strongly in favor of Col. Burr, now burst forth without disguise.* There is not time to comment on these transactions; but two or three facts may tend to disclose the motives which are generally viewed as a *persecution.*"

Let the above extracts be compared with the following remarks from a leading administration print in Virginia:

"On the 5th of November [1806] Burr had been arraigned of high treason at Lexington, [Lexington!] Kentucky, and though discharged, no man doubted his *guilt.*"

* See R. B. Currey's statement, No. 11

ject trust in the enlightened intelligence, and the noble and confiding natures of the American people; and whether it might not be thought a more than sufficient answer to the base surmises, the unworthy suspicions, and the feebly labored arguments, which have been circulated with so much industry, to point with emphasis to a long life devoted to the service of his country; his boyhood given to the war of the revolution and to the achievement of her independence; his mature manhood to the honest and faithful discharge of all the duties of her highest civil employments; and his late years, when age might claim an exemption from toil and danger;—when these, his accusers, were to be found in the courts and palaces of Kings, or reposing in the lap of ease and luxury, he was only to be found in the wilderness and on the field of battle; only in the pursuit or in the face of the *enemies of his country*, exposed to every peril, to every privation, to every suffering, before which the coward or the traitor's heart would have quailed or been subdued. This might be relied on as a sufficient reply to the charge, that General Jackson was tainted with treason, and that he was leagued and connected with traitors and enemies to his country;—and how ill-timed and ungraciously, this charge comes at this late day! There was a time of all others, when if true, or if colored by the semblance of truth, it should have been urged and loudly trumpeted; in the dark and stormy period of 1813 and 1814, when treason was much spoken of and much feared; when a severance of the Union was not darkly hinted at, but boldly spoken of in the capitol; not about to be effected by two empty flat boats, and half a dozen unarmed men, but urged, countenanced, and supported by the most powerful nation on earth, then our foe, and hanging on all our coasts and frontiers, with her victorious and numerous fleets and armies; *then* was the time when traitors should have been denounced; when Jackson, if suspected, should have been branded with infamy, and all power and confidence withheld from him; then, when he was to take the command of one division of the armies of the United States, to be invested with unlimited military power, then should he have been held up as shrouded in suspicion, and unworthy to be trusted. But did a whisper, a murmur, then, of doubt, or distrust, break forth? All looked to him as a father and friend, with whom in that fearful hour, the safety of the nation and its highest powers could be deposited with the utmost security.

But having the proofs, we deemed it best to present them, which not only positively and directly disprove this charge, in all its forms, and expose the propagators of it to shame and confusion; but will shed additional lustre on the endowments both of the head and heart of this distinguished benefactor of his country; and prove the truth of that elevated and manly sentiment expressed to his friends, in reference to this subject, when loose scraps and notes written in haste many years ago, and long forgotten were raked up and published: "I recollect them not; but this I do know, and avow, that never in all my life, did I entertain even a thought, that I would not cheerfully submit to the judgment of the American people, and stand or fall by their decision."

APPENDIX.

[1]

Extract of a letter from Gen. James Robertson to the Hon. Daniel Smith, dated—

NASHVILLE, Dec. 23d, 1806.

SIR: Great anxiety appears to prevail in this place to see the President's message, as it will give some information how our relations are with the European powers. Col. Burr left this yesterday, with two large boats, in order to descend the Mississippi river. Many conjectures are formed respecting his designs. I cannot harbor an opinion that he has any views inimical to the United States. I did not see him, though he was three or four days in this place; but last fall he dined with me, and I was several times in his company. He then told me he expected to make settlements with his son-in-law on the western waters. I endeavored to find how the Executive of our government was held with; but he was so guarded, I gained but little satisfaction, but I thought he spoke rather in favor—this might have been his knowing my opinion. I, from that time, have had some doubts of his friendship.

[2]

Extract of a letter from Gen. James Robertson to Gen. Daniel Smith, dated—

NASHVILLE, Feb. 2d, 1807.

We are all quiet at present, but there was an uncommon bustle for several weeks after the President's proclamation appeared here, and if it had reached this place before Burr's departure, he would have been arrested, notwithstanding his acquittal in Kentucky.

You know before the exposition of his schemes, he was held in high esteem by the citizens of this place, on account of the exertions he made in the Senate of the United States at the time of our admission as an independent State into the Union. But when the proclamation appeared, the general cry was, let us to a man go in a mass to suppress such base projects, and bring Burr and his adherents to the bar of justice: and I believe it would not have been difficult to have raised a thousand volunteers to have gone to Natchez or New-Orleans from West Tennessee. Burr, as I understand, at his leaving Nashville with two boats, still insisted that his intention was to settle in lower Louisiana, and that he was taking provisions to furnish his son-in-law, who would go with him from South-Carolina.

[3.]

Extract of a letter from Thomas Stuart, Esq. at that time attorney for the United States, to Gen. Daniel Smith, Senator in Congress, dated

NASHVILLE, Jan 3d, 1807.

SIR: I received your letter of Dec. 15th, 1806. Colonel Burr's transactions have made much noise here also. You request me to inform you what is known on that subject in Tennessee. On this point I am able to give you very little satisfaction. He has visited Nashville and its vicinity two or the course of this winter; he has been [illegible] with respectful attention by many of the citizens—he had two or three boats built upon Stone's river, and started in one of them from Nashville down Cumberland river, about a week ago, with eight hands, without arms, supplied with conveniences for descending the Mississippi. I understand his other boats are to take in [illegible] at Stone's river.

and that he has purchased a considerable quantity of pork at Clarksville. The enclosed, taken from Eastin's paper, shows how he is viewed by some of the citizens of this place. [That extract alludes to the burning of Burr's effigy, 30th December, 1806.]

Stokely Hays and a son of Capt. Harney's, have gone down with him. His ostensible object, I understand, was the colonization of a large tract of land on the Washita; but the circumstances did not appear to fit that. A certain air of mystery in his conduct excited suspicion; this suspicion was confirmed by his having been suspected elsewhere. The paper called the "Western World," held him up to public view as a conspirator, connected with Wilkinson and Sebastian. When men attempted to view his objects, they found themselves surrounded with darkness; their imaginations were let loose, and to many he became an object of horror.

I am confident that no scheme could be more universally execrated here, than a separation of the State of Tennessee from the Union. I believe the idea of the conquest of Mexico, unconnected with the other, would have been very popular some time ago, and that a war with Spain was wished; but I believe many people have changed their minds on that point, owing to a very general distrust, now prevailing, of the fidelity and integrity of him who would conduct the operation. A Russellville paper states, that a Davis Floyd, sheriff of Indiana county, opposite Louisville, had descended the river, with 300 men, to join Burr; but I am persuaded he will never make many conquests with the soldiers he will raise in Ohio, Kentucky or Tennessee. I expect Burr's real views were disclosed to very few, if any, in this country. Before Burr came to Nashville the last time, he had been tried by the Grand Jury in Kentucky, and must have satisfied those who continued here to treat him with hospitality, of the rectitude of his intentions. He must have been very cautious in Kentucky in disclosing his real views, for among the numerous witnesses examined before the Grand Jury, many of them apparently, his particular friends, none could testify against him. I have been frequently urged to commence a prosecution against him here, but I never could find any evidence against him, except public opinion. I think it very probable if he had been here when the President's proclamation and Gen. William Eaton's statement arrived, he would have been assassinated. The volunteer militia of Tennessee are in motion.

[4.]

DR. ROBERTSON'S STATEMENT.

NASHVILLE, July 20th, 1828.

Dear Sir:—Your note of the 18th instant is received, making inquiry relative to my recollection of Col. Burr's visit to this neighborhood, &c. The first time I ever saw Col. Burr, was in this place, in September, 1806. He was received, both publicly and privately, with marked distinction. It was generally understood and believed, that his object was the settling of some lands, he claimed on the borders of Louisiana, Ouachita; but if a war between Spain and the United States, took place, then to seize on, and revolutionize the adjoining colony of Spain. This scheme was very popular in this country at that time, and encouraged by most of the leading men. Col. Burr circulated the report that our government was favorable towards his views, and intimated that it was probable the government troops, stationed near the Sabine, would ultimately co-operate with him. The public feeling on the subject, at this juncture, indicated that he would receive much aid from this quarter. He staid here but a few days, went to Kentucky, where he was shortly after arrested, under the charge of treason; tried and acquitted—and again in December made his appearance in Nashville. His reception was very different now from that in September. He was very generally neglected, and even shunned. But even at this period, very few persons with whom I conversed, believed that he had any treasonable designs against his government. *Suspicion*, however, hung about him, and the people discovered that he had decived them as to the feelings of our government towards his enterprise, and lost confidence in him. He hastened his business to a close, and left the neighborhood in a short time, with barely men enough to work his boats out of the river, instead of the splendid armament, which appearances on his first visit had led him to expect.—I understood he left this country apparently great mortified; complaining of the neglect he had encountered in this last visit.

I know of no circumstance, in this matter which could point suspicion to General Jackson in preference to any other prominent man, unless it be that Col. S. D. Hays, [a nephew of Mrs. Jackson] accompanied Burr to the lower country; and with those who knew the young man, this could have no weight. I always understood that Mr. Hays went against the advice and wishes of General Jackson. I have been intimately acquainted with Col. Hays from his infancy, and know he has always been in the habit of relying on his own judgment, and disposed to execute its decisions, independent of the opinions of others. I saw General Coffee a few days after Burr's departure, who told me he went off complaining of the treatment he had received from General Jackson, and most of his other acquaintance of the country. He had become so extremely peevish, that General Coffee said he could do nothing which seemed to please him. I never have understood, that Col. Hays' trip with Burr had injured him in the public estimation. He is at this time, a highly respectable citizen of this State. Very respectfully,

FELIX ROBERTSON.

To the Chairman of the Nashville Committee.

[5.]

Extract of a letter from Judge Nathaniel W. Williams, of Tennessee, to Nathaniel W. W. Kerr, Esq. dated 18th December, 1827.

"MY DEAR SIR:—It is madness to think of Jackson for President of the United States. This Burr matter I cannot be mistaken about—my eyes and ears are my witnesses. He (Jackson) offered me a commission of Captain in Burr's army, or told me I could get one if I would accept. And during this affair he said to me, in the presence of Judge ——, (who though now says he does not remember it) "depend upon it, gentlemen, the division of the United States has taken deep root. You will find a number of the Senate, and a number of the members of the House of Representatives deeply involved in this scheme."

[6.]

Gen. Jackson to Judge Williams.

HERMITAGE, Feb. 23, 1828.

SIR—Having received a letter from a high minded, honorable gentleman of Virginia, who loves *truth, and knows how to appreciate character*, I lose no time in laying before you the postscript of his letter, which is in the following words, to wit: "It may be well to say that a letter was handed about at the *Adams Convention*, I hear, accusing you of being concerned in Burr's conspiracy, upon the authority of Judge Nathaniel Williams of your State. The report is, that his Judge Williams writes, when a young man, he applied to you, then a Judge, to sign his license as a lawyer; that you did so, but recommended to him, as you conceived him to be a man of promise, to push his fortune by joining Burr, *who was then in your house*; promising, if he would do so, to procure him a commission as Captain in Burr's army. This story is going the rounds from the Adams delegates, who have returned home, notwithstanding they ought to know that you was the first person to put Governor Claiborne on his guard, against the schemes of Burr. "VERBUM SAT."

The records of the country contradict this statement, as it is well known that I resigned my appointment of Judge before Colonel Burr *ever was in the State of Tennessee*. I cannot, then, for one moment, permit myself to believe, that you, elevated as you are, to a seat on the judicial bench of Tennessee, could give your authority to such an unfounded falsehood. Duty to myself, as well as justice to you, therefore, requires that I should, without delay, advise you of this libel upon my character, so that you may at once declare whether you are or are not the author of this calumny, before I expose it as such.

I am, and have been, well advised of a secret combination of a *base and wicked few* in Tennessee, whose object is to slander me, but, until *now*, I have never heard or had the least intimation, that you were of that *group*. Nor do I now believe that you, who must be so well satisfied of the falsehood contained in the postscript of the letter referred to above, as well as the rectitude of my conduct since your acquaintance with me, could be so lost to *virtue* and *truth* as to have originated and put in circulation so base a calumny. With this impression I sent D. S. Donelson to you with this communication, having no doubt, as an honorable man, that you will send me a frank and prompt reply.

(A copy, signed) ANDREW JACKSON.

The Hon. NATHANIEL WILLIAMS,
Judge of the Circuit Court of Tennessee.

[7.]

Judge Williams' reply to General Jackson.

SPARTA, FEB. 27th, 1828.

After copying from General Jackson's letter to me, the report as stated in his letter, I wrote as follows:

I can very frankly deny ever having written the letter spoken of by the gentleman who wrote you from Washington, but I did write a letter to a relation of mine, at that time in Richmond. The letter, if seen, would show that it was designed as a confidential one. I do not at this time, recollect accurately what the letter did contain; I believe, though I can remember a part, if not the whole, of what I intended at the time; and, I will state it, as it is but just that what has been by my means privately circulated, should be publicly avowed under the necessities of this case.

Some time after Burr had passed Nashville, once or twice, to the lower country, before Mr. Jefferson's Proclamation, in riding from Gen. Jackson's house to Nashville, Gen. Jackson, in reference to that conspiracy, said to me, "that I could, if I would accept it, obtain a commission of Captain."

Afterwards, during the setting of the county Court of Sumner, at a time when Patton Anderson told me that either Burr or Adair, or both of them, were at Gen. Jackson's house, in a room of a tavern then kept by Edmund Crutcher, Gen. Jackson said to me—I think Judge Stuart was then in the room—"Take notice, gentlemen, you will find that a division of the United States has taken deep root; you will find that a number of the members of the House of Representatives are deeply involved in the scheme."

I am not certain that the above was contained in my private letter to Mr. Nathaniel Kerr, but as I have made these statements privately, it is but just that I should now avow them.

I am in hopes, Sir, that this letter will be altogether satisfactory to you, for Gen. Jackson may be assured (the Presidential question aside) no man can feel more bound to Gen. Jackson than myself, for the great honor conferred by him on my country.

(Copy.) NATH. W. WILLIAMS.

GEN. ANDREW JACKSON.

[8]

JUDGE WILLIAMS' STATEMENT.

Under the belief that it is my duty to make the following statement, I make it. I moved to Nashville, Tenn. from the county of Pittsylvania, Virginia, in the fall of the year 1804, at the age of twenty-five, that is, I moved from Virginia, in 1803, to Hawkins Courthouse, East Tennessee and from there I moved to Nashville. In 1806 or '7, these Burr matters transpired. I, before protesting against the proceeding of Burr, had been frequently employed in Gen. Jackson's collecting business and other suits of his. I think in the spring or fall of 1806, in riding from the General's house to Nashville, near the Clover Bottom, he spoke to me in relation to a commission in Burr's army. And in the same year, at Gallatin, he made the declarations in relation to the division of the Union, as stated in our correspondence. I not only then determined that I would not agree to what I believed to be Burr's schemes, but that I would oppose him as far as I could. Either before or after Mr. Jefferson's proclamation, it was, as I thought, intended to impress the public mind with the belief that a ball, then on hand in Nashville, was intended as a mark of respect to Col. Burr. A number of gentlemen in Nashville, to destroy this impression and to show their disapprobation of Burr, determined that Col. Burr should not attend the Ball, and so informed Col. Burr through Judge John Overton, who returned with the information, as he told me, from Burr, that Col. Burr had declined coming to the

Hall. With this we were satisfied.* About the time the ball was half over, I was standing against the wall, opposite the door of entrance in the room, and saw General Jackson lead Burr by the arm into the room, and introduce him, with considerable form, to the ladies and gentlemen then present. I do not recollect at this time that Mr. Jefferson's proclamation had any effect on the persons then about Nashville, who were, from their conduct justly liable to our suspicions, and I think, I took some pains to inquire into that circumstance.—Some time afterwards our party, to show their further indignation, burnt Burr publicly in effigy. I have always believed that during this Burr matter, that Major Tilman Dixon informed me by letter, that Gen. Coffee had been engaged in procuring boats and provisions for Burr on Cumberland River, though the letter if there was one, I cannot now find, and I have examined for it. It was my understanding, at the time, that Col. Stokely D. Hays went off as one of Burr's men in his boats, and I have never heard it disputed since. Col. Hays is a nephew of Mrs. Jackson. Although I never was at Gen. Jackson's house with Burr, yet I am tolerably well satisfied, according to my recollection at this time of occurrences then, that in the fall of 1806, and winter of 1807, Burr and Gen. Jackson were very intimate, and that Burr was frequently at the general's house. The above is a statement of the most prominent facts as they are fixed on my recollection. If I am mistaken about any thing, it is about dates, and about them I do not pretend to accuracy.

NATH. W. WILLIAMS.

A list of gentlemen in the ball room at the time, and who were present on the public square of Nashville, when Burr was burnt in effigy, as well as now recollected.

Geo. W. L. Marr, Esq. atto. at law; Wm. Smith, atto. at law, and now Clerk of the circuit ct. of Williamson county; Tho. Swann, of Va. atto. at law, (dead); Doct. Watkins, of E. Tenn.; John G. Blount, of N. Carolina; Judge Porter, of Louisiana; V. Tonstall, of Pittsylvania county, Va. E. S. Hall; —— Curry, former Postmaster at Nashville.

I am not certain that the gentlemen referred to were present, if not they can say; the greater part I am pretty confident were present. I very well know there were at the burning of the effigy from one to two hundred individuals.

N. W. WILLIAMS.

[9.]

From the Sparta Review:

Jackson and Burr.—In your last number of the Review you defend Gen. Jackson, or you say, the Telegraph defends him, on the ground that a number of respectable veterans of the revolution (Col. Rob't Hays, among the number, the brother in-law of Gen. Jackson,) addressed the General with a view to aid him in his efforts to suppress the *degraded* Aaron Burr. The Telegraph does not fix the time at which the address was made, but says it was made a few weeks after Jackson wrote to Gov Claiborne. Claiborne's Letter, you say, was on the 12th November 1806, and a few weeks after that time would be about the 1st of December 1806. It would be important to know where Burr was at that time—*the time* of Jackson's letter to Claiborne. At what part of Cumberland hiyboats were building—whether at the mouth of Stone's river, or higher up the Cumberland River—nearer to Gen. Jackson's house. It would be material also to know who the Gen.'s friends, and relatives were, who were preparing to go off with Burr, and who did in fact go off with him! See a copy of John Hoover's letter here enclosed.

Now, from Burr's trial, it appears that the conspirators on the Ohio, fled from Blennerhasset's Island on the 10th December, 1806, and were at the mouth of Cumberland, as soon as they could conveniently get there; where they met with Col. Burr, who harangued the men, and told them he would develope his schemes to them more fully, than he could with safety to his interests, do there. So it is believed, that at the precise time when this letter was addressed by Col. Robert Hays, and other revolutionary veterans to the General, Aaron Burr was in the neighborhood of Gen. Jackson's, building boats; and many of the General's near relations and friends were preparing to go off with him. The Telegraph makes Col. Robert Hays express the language in the address at the precise time when his son, Stokely D. Hays, was preparing to go off in boats built for Burr at the mouth of Stone's river, a point on the Cumberland, near to Gen. Jackson's house. I lived in Nashville at the time when that address was first published in the papers, and according to my recollection, it was before there was any talk of Burr's conspiracy. It now occurs to me, that it grew out of the prospect of a Spanish war, and the relation of Wilkinson and the Spanish army, on the river Sabine; and I believe it had at the time of its first publication, no other connexion with Col. Burr. He is believed though, to have been somewhere in the Western country—perhaps near Nashville. I remember to have held a conversation with Judge John Overton, on the same evening, or the next morning, after Gen. Jackson led Burr into the ball room at Talbot's tavern. Overton, Jackson, and myself, and other friends before that time, had been on terms of the strictest intimacy, and it was the office of Judge Overton, on that occasion, to remonstrate with me, on account of the part I was then taking against Burr. I recollect distinctly in that conversation, his reference to this company of old men, whose address had been signed and delivered long before to Jackson, and asked me if I supposed such men were inimical to the country, and willing to commit treason. If I answered any thing, I must have answered as I now believe, that *that* address had no connexion with, or allusion to Burr. This conversation was perhaps the very evening Judge Overton came to

*Judge Overton has no recollection of having undertaken this *ungracious errand*, after Col. Burr had been invited by the Managers, as stated by Dr. T. G. Watkins, in his letter of the 14th of May, 1828, published in the Virginia Advocate of the 2d August, which gives an account of this Ball, believed to be substantially correct. See also the statement of Robt. B. Carrey, late Postmaster, which shows that Judge Williams must be mistaken; especially when it is considered that it is somewhat different from the account first published by him in the Sparta Review—marked No. 1.

ing, with the information that Col. Burr would not attend the ball, as his company would be disagreeable.*

State also, if you please, Mr. Editor, that in the town of M'Minnville, there lives a man of the name of Theodorick Burton—a man of truth and respectability, as I have heard ever—when states that, in 1805, *he was one of Burr's men*, and was mustered into service at the Clover Bottom, with arms in their hands—that about seventy-five men signed the list of enrolment at the same time with himself—that at that time Gen. Jackson and Aaron Burr, were on the ground, and that Patton Anderson was his Captain. Burton says when the men under Anderson separated, it was under an agreement, as to the time when they were to march off with Burr, as his men—and that before that time came round, the matter bursted. This is a condensed view of what Mr. Burton says, who refuses to give a written statement. Now, when Gen. Jackson was summoned as a witness to Richmond against Burr, if he had called on Burton as another witness, the Government would have been enabled to have proved an overt act of Treason on Burr—Treason, when connected with Gen. Eaton's and Commodore Truxtun's evidence. Why, let me ask, did he fail to do so? When I recollect, that the destruction of the American Institutions was the object of the Burr Conspiracy, and that Gen. Jackson was in the possession of facts and circumstances which could have convicted the Conspirators, and yet improperly withheld them when summoned to Richmond to give testimony, thereby enabling them to escape from punishment, I am filled with astonishment, that the American Nation should think for a moment, of supporting his pretensions to the highest office in the gift of the people. In view of this state of things, I tremble for my country's honor and safety.

If Mr. Jefferson, invested as he was with such political power and authority, had been as friendly to Burr's schemes as Jackson is believed to have been, it is impossible for the mind of man to conceive the disasters that would have threatened the safety of this Union.

NATH. W. WILLIAMS.

[10.]

WILLIAM SMITH'S STATEMENT.

FRANKLIN, Aug. 27th, 1828.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your note, which came to hand on the evening of yesterday, requesting me to state what I recollect of Aaron Burr being at a ball at Nashville, many years ago—what transpired on that occasion, and also as to his having been burned in effigy in that place, I would remark, that I was not present at the ball Judge Williams speaks of, neither was I in Nashville on the evening of the ball. I afterwards understood that Col. Burr attended it, and that the company generally, and the ladies particularly, were much pleased with his gentlemanly and courtly deportment. I do not recollect having heard that any objections were made to the propriety of the attendance of Col. Burr at this Ball—if such existed at this time, they were confined to the persons entertaining them, as least so far as I know, never having heard of them.

I do not recollect having heard Judge Williams express himself unfriendly to Col. Burr, in his enterprise, until after conjecture and rumour had assured to it a treasonable character. Some short time after Burr left Nashville, (when he was on his way to New Orleans I believe,) some

* Judge Williams says—"When this letter was addressed by Colonel Robert Hays, and other revolutionary veterans to the general," he "lived in Nashville, at the time, when that address was first published in the papers, and according to my recollection it was before there was any talk of Burr's conspiracy." Here, again, the Judge's memory fails him. The address of "*the revolutionary veterans*" was first published in the Impartial Review, the only newspaper then in Nashville, on the 10th January, 1807, immediately after it was delivered to Gen. Jackson, as is understood and believed—certain it is, that it was after the arrival of the President's Proclamation of the 27th Nov. 1806, which was on the 27th of Dec. 1806, after Col. Burr left Nashville the last time (same message) for which see Doctor Thos. G. Watkins' letter under date of August 16th, 1828, to the Editors of the Knoxville Register of Aug. 27th, and Robert B. Currey's statement, Appendix No. 11. Besides, it is known to many persons in society here, that this address was delivered after the arrival of the Proclamation, which was the first authentic information of Burr's schemes; and the face of the address plainly indicates a knowledge of the fact. Being thus under an erroneous impression in relation to the date of this address, it follows as a necessary consequence, that Judge Williams is in error, in attributing to Judge Overton the conversation respecting an affair which did not happen for nearly three weeks after the Ball, when this conversation is stated to have taken place. This Ball was a regular one of the season, which was held monthly, and the one which took place in December, 1806, was on the 19th of the month. Gen. Jackson was one of the regular subscribers to these Balls, which, for the promotion of social intercourse, he then usually attended. See Talbot's Tavern Journal. Gen. Jackson came from his residence in the country, and was at this Ball. Col. Burr was invited by the managers, and was also there. It appears from the Impartial Review that he arrived in Nashville on the 17th, and the Ball took place on the 19th. Judge Philips, one of this committee, states that he was also at this Ball—that in the evening, previous to its commencement, he was in company with Mr. Nath. Williams (now Judge Williams) when the conversation turned on the subject of the amusements of the evening, and respecting Col. Burr's being at the Ball, when it was distinctly understood by the company that Col. Burr was to be there, having been invited by the managers. He has an indistinct recollection that Mr. Williams raised the question as to the propriety of his being invited, but it seemed to be conceded by almost every person, that Col. Burr was entitled to the common civilities of social intercourse, usually observed towards distinguished or respectable strangers. When in the Ball room, Judge Philips did not see any marked attentions on the part of Gen. Jackson towards Col. Burr—if there were any such, it has escaped his recollection. See also on this subject Mr. Currey's statement, marked No. 11.

persons burned him in effigy. I was not in Nashville when this took place, but heard that some few individuals caused the effigy to be made, and procured some persons to take it to the public square and set it on fire; but who made it, or who committed it to the flames I do not know, but think Judge Williams informed me that he had some hand in the affair. I would observe, in conclusion, that it has been so long since these things occurred, that many minor particulars may, and doubtless have, escaped my recollection; but of the correctness of the preceding statement I have no doubt, so far as memory, (after a lapse of many years,) may be relied upon. I am, Sir, yours, &c.

W. SMITH.

[11.]

MR. CURREY'S STATEMENT.

Nashville, Aug. 25th, 1828.

Having seen in the public prints a statement of N. W. Williams that I was present at the burning of Col. Burr's effigy, and knowing the same to be destitute of truth, I was led to examine into the accuracy of some of his other assertions, and am astonished that any person having pretensions to candor, should hazard statements so inaccurate both as to dates and matters of fact.

The Ball which he now would wish to be considered as having been got up as a mark of respect to Burr, after the receipt of the President's proclamation, was in fact one of our regular Assembly Balls; and though Judge Williams may have lost the recollection of my given name, as well as other things of more importance, yet if he has a lucid moment, the Judge must recollect he called on me the day preceding the Ball, to address the managers to exclude Col. Burr, which he said I could do with more propriety as one of the original subscribers by the season, (which I think he said he was not,) and that I positively objected, and gave as my reasons, that it would be violating the hospitality already offered, on mere rumor, which might or might not be true. I believe that the performance of this piece of etiquette was not imposed on the managers—Col. Burr attended, and was politely received, as far as my observation extended.

In giving the following statement, my recollection, though it perfectly serves me, is supported by a reference to a correspondence with the Postmaster General on the subject. The message and proclamation of the President, accompanied by Gen. Eaton's communication, arrived at Nashville on the 27th Dec. 1806,* several days after Col. Burr descended the river, and not before; and it was on this occasion that the effigy of Col. Burr was burnt. It was conjectured then that Col. Burr must have reached the Ohio, and might be on the Mississippi, if not detained. I was not one of Mr. Williams' party at this effigy burning, as he asserts, nor did I ever witness a ceremony of the kind, believing that such measures were better suited to the ignorant, than an enlightened community of freemen, whose laws and ballot box are open for the punishment of offenders; and find that in mentioning this effigy in my letter to the Postmaster General (for the credit of our town) I deemed an apology necessary. These communications were made in compliance with instructions from the Postmaster General to inform him of the state of affairs, &c. &c. I was not commissioned Postmaster for some time after this, but had been the acting Postmaster for several years.

Seth Pease, Esq. arrived here early in January, 1807, and showed me his instructions from the Post Master General, requiring my co-operation in inquiring into Col Burr's projects, &c. After remaining as long as he deemed necessary, he set out for the Mississippi Territory; being then or shortly after, appointed Surveyor General of that Territory—Mr. Pease, while here, was persevering; mingling occasionally in mixed companies *in cognito*. He told me before he left this place, that he was perfectly satisfied if Col. Burr had any treasonable views he had not disclosed them here; but that he had imposed on some by false pretences, of an expedition against Mexico, in which he was to be aided or at least sanctioned by our Government, that if the U. S. Army then on the line should fail to co-operate, and they were overpowered, it would cover their retreat, and they could fall back, settle on Baron Bastrop's grant, and wait a more favorable opportunity, as a war with Spain was inevitable: and that he imposed on others, by the promise of Washita lands, inducing them to believe that his views extended no further than a peaceable settlement there.

Mr. Williams called on me frequently after Col. Burr became an object of suspicion, and in my office, conversed freely on the subject, and as I thought withheld nothing, yet he never told me that Gen. Jackson wanted to enlist him to fight the Spaniards, nor even mentioned his name as connected with or even knowing to any of Col. Burr's schemes.

It would appear superfluous in me, a private, though an old citizen, to offer my testimony of the innocence of Gen. Jackson, further than known facts may serve to defend his well earned fame from foul aspersions: Those who know me, know him, and I feel confident that no one who does know him, can conscientiously and solemnly say, that they believe or ever did believe, that he ever knew of and approved, or even connived at treason—no; but rather that his firm integrity in support of the Union, the constitution, and our republican institutions in their purity, has whetted the envy of his opponents because of the contrast.

ROBERT B. CURREY.

[13.]

WILLIS ALSTON'S STATEMENT.

I hereby certify, that in a conversation with Mr. Jefferson, then President of the United States, respecting the movement of Col. Burr in the West, I observed that the rumour of the day was, that General Andrew Jackson had

---

* Extract of a letter from James Saunders to Gen. Daniel Smith, Senator in Congress, dated 1st January, 1807.

"By the last papers I have received the President's message—also his proclamation, which I suppose was produced by the acts of Aaron Burr."

By reference to the books of the Postmaster, it appears that the Northern mail arrived in Nashville on the 27th December, 1806. Of course this was the last mail referred to in Mr. Saunders' letter of the 1st January, 1807—the mail arriving but once a week.

joined Burr. Not so, or, not true, said Mr. Jefferson, for I this day received a letter from him (Gen. Jackson,) informing me that he had seen Burr, and that Burr said his enterprise was sanctioned by the government, and he, Jackson, had been tendered a high command by Burr, and asked of Mr. Jefferson the views of the Government, tendering his services, if wanted, to make a descent upon Mexico, as stated by Burr, but if Burr was not authorized by the government to carry on his enterprise as stated, then he, Jackson, was ready to arrest him

WILLIS ALSTON.

Chamber of the H. Representatives, 7
February 11th, 1828. 5

(14)

COL. HAYS' LETTER.

The Chairman of the Jackson Committee at Nashville.

Sir—In answer to your call on me, for any information in my possession in relation to the *Burr business,* I have to remark, that Col. Burr was an intimate friend and brother officer of my father, during the revolutionary war. He visited him in 1804 or 5—became acquainted with me; professed to be much pleased with me, and enlisted my feelings for him. He requested my father to permit me to go with him to New York and study law. He objected, on the ground that I was too young, and had not advanced sufficiently in my Academical course. But it was agreed and understood that I should go in the course of two or three years to finish my education with Col. Burr. In the winter of 1806, 7, the Col. came to Nashville, and sent for me when at school, near there, and on meeting him, he claimed the promise which had been made to him on his first visit—but stated he was going by the way of the Mississippi, and that I must accompany him, and that he had seen my father and obtained his consent—that he received me as a son, and I must consider him in the character of a father. I observed to him, that I must see and consult my friends, before I gave my final consent. On advising with them, some doubt of Mr. Burr's object was suggested, but he having pledged his word of honor, that he had nothing in view hostile to the best interests of the United States, I determined to go with him. Mr. C. C. Claiborne was at that time Governor of Louisiana, and an old friend of my father's, and had requested him to permit me to go to New Orleans as his private Secretary. To him Gen. Jackson wrote a letter, and gave me to deliver, urging it on me, in the most earnest manner, to leave Burr, if at any time I should discover he had any views or intentions inimical to the interests or integrity of the Government. I left my father's on horseback, about the middle of December, 1806, and joined Mr. Burr at the mouth of Cumberland river, and went with him down to the mouth of Bayou Pierre, where I left him, and saw him no more, except at a ball in Washington, Mississippi, and on his trial there before the Court.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. D. HAYS.

JOHN OVERTON,
Chairman Nashville Committee.

[15.]

LETTER OF MR. GRAVES.

To Capt. Andrew J. Donelson,

Sir—In answer to your verbal inquiry thro' Col. Williamson, I can inform you what I said to him, and will always say, when called on, to wit:—That at the time Col. Burr was building a boat on Stone's river, or near the mouth of it, there was a rumor among the people that he wanted forty or fifty, or more, young men to go with him to some place not known, and that he would give liberal wages A young man, Mr. Rotherford Rutland, had some notion of going with Burr, but seemed unwilling to embark unless he knew his intentions, and could receive some certain assurance of the amount of wages. As I was going to Nashville in company with the said Rutherford Rutland, we found Gen. Jackson at a store near the Clover Bottom, and I there remarked to Rutland that he had better ask Gen. Jackson if he knew Burr's intentions, before he engaged himself to descend the river with him. He did so, and the General answered in a very prompt and decided manner, that he knew nothing of Burr's intentions, and advised him to stay at home.

JOHN G. GRAVES.

JNO. OVERTON, *Chairman.*

R. C. FOSTER,	DAN'L. GRAHAM,
R. WHYTE,	JESSE WHARTON,
JNO. CATRON,	JOSIAH NICHOL.
G. W. CAMPBELL,	EDWARD WARD,
TH. CLAIBORNE,	WM. B. LEWIS,
F'X. ROBERTSON,	WM. L. BROWN,
JOS. PHILIPS,	WM. WHITE,
JNO. SHELBY,	ALFRED BALCH.

DAN'L. GRAHAM, *Secretary.*

From the New York Evening Post.

The following is taken from the Pennsylvanian, a well conducted weekly paper, published in Philadelphia, devoted principally to literature, and although occasionally introducing political topics, yet always treating them with great moderation and decorum—We take it for granted therefore, that the particulars related in the article below are unquestionably authentic, and we recommend it to the sober consideration of the slanderers of Gen. Jackson's character.

Characteristic Anecdote.—A young missionary from the Dutch Reformed Church, while on his way some years ago to his station among some of the western Indians, fell sick near Nashville, Tennessee. His funds were small, and the Classis of Albany, or thereabouts, from which he came, were slow in his remittances. His money soon went away for medicine and boarding; his horse followed; and after a while he had little remaining of the things of this world but a relapsed bilious fever, and a scanty pair of saddle bags. He called his landlord, and announced his condition: his remnant of clothing, he said, would scarcely defray the expenses of his burial; and if he continued longer a living inmate of the tavern, it must be without the hope of compensation to those around him. The innkeeper was embarrassed; for his own slender means did not invite to the exercise of costly hospitality; yet his conscience refused to turn the sick stranger from his house. A plan at last struck him for the relief of both parties. "You must be carried, he said, to the Hermitage, to General Jackson's." It was, indeed, a severe trial for the young missionary, to become the volunteer guest of so formidable a personage, the murderer of Arbuthnot and Ambrister,

who hung the prophet Francis, and shot the six militia men. But there was no alternative: he had no right to remain where he was; and when the General's carriage arrived to convey him away, he entered it with a determined feeling of a martyr. His disease was violent and obstinate; but after a fortnight of almost unremitting delirium, during which his imagination was busy with scalps and tomahawks, and deeds of blood, his constitution triumphed. Awaking to a consciousness of his situation, he found himself in an airy, comfortable apartment, where every thing was quiet, simple, and unostentatious. The elderly matron, who sat watching silently by his pillow, might have served for a model of that charity, which suffereth long and is kind; and her venerable partner, who came in soon after, had nothing about him of the fierce and vindictive expression, with which a morbid fancy had painted him. As his strength returned, the stranger had many opportunities of studying the character of his host, and of observing the estimation in which others held him. He saw him frank, intelligent, and kind-hearted; the guardian of the orphan, the adviser of the friendless, and the favorite depository of all those trusts, which are considered most responsible and sacred among men. He found his house the refuge of the widow and the poor, and his table the pattern of the simple but cordial hospitality of the west. He stood with him in the morning and evening circle of family devotion, and heard him pray for the forgiveness of his enemies. He smiled at his own delusion, as he contrasted the excellent old chief with the portrait which his imagination had delineated. Some four weeks afterwards, the young clergyman was seen, renewed in health, well mounted, and his purse well filled by the General's liberality, plodding his way to the missionary station. His first letter to his friends told of all these things and invoked the blessings of Heaven on the good Samaritan, who had relieved him in his hour of need.

From the Hartford Times.

As the election approaches, the Adams men are reviving their often told slanders against Gen. Jackson, and in order to carry their points, it is not to be doubted that every species of calumny will be resorted to, until the election takes place. We would put our friends on their guard against giving credence to what may be asserted by them, for we shall not be surprised if they put in circulation on the very eve of the election, reports that he is dead or that some calamity has befallen him. Those who could print and issue the coffin handbills, who can put such vile constructions on the motives and conduct of some of our best men, that Jackson and his friends might be injured, are capable of any species of fraud that malice and intrigue can invent or propagate.

It has been unfortunate for the Adams party, that they commenced their falsehoods at so early a period. They have been met and exposed, and those whom they have once deceived, will be cautious, and guarded against future impositions.

The administration zealots have recently had much to say of danger of evil examples, in public men, and are telling their friends to beware of Jackson. If elected he would not go galloping through the country on the sabbath, dressed in the garb of a jockey. He would not lend his influence to fan the embers of a fanatical excitement against the masonic institution, or write letters for *private* circulation against a body of men, many of whom in point of patriotism, talents and every civil or moral qualification are immeasurably superior to Mr. Adams.

Nor would he call to his cabinet or retain as Secretary of State, a man who could challenge to the field of mortal combat, a Senator of the United States, in violation of the constitution, and the laws of God and man. Mr. Adams has shown himself the friend and patron of duellists. He has protected and taken to his confidence Henry Clay, and that too under the circumstances (seting aside the bargain and sale) which no other man would have done, who respected himself or the laws. The following is the *Brimstone epistle* of Henry Clay issued on the 31st of January, 1825. Within little more than thirty days from its publication the same individual, who challenges the whole world, who holds his adversary as he does himself *responsible to all the laws which govern and regulate men of honor*, is nominated by John Quincy Adams to the second office of the Government.

"*A Card.*—I have seen without any other emotion than that of ineffable contempt, the abuse which has been poured out upon me by a scurrilous paper, issued in this city, and by other kindred prints and persons, in regard to the Presidential Election. The editor of one of those prints ushered forth in Philadelphia, called the Columbian Observer, for which I do not subscribe, and which I have not ordered, has had the impudence to transmit to me his vile paper of the 28th inst. In that number is inserted a letter, purporting to have been written from this city, on the 25th inst. by a member of the House of Representatives, belonging to the Pennsylvania delegation. I believe it to be a forgery; but, if it be genuine, I pronounce the member, whoever he may be, a base and infamous calumniator, a dastard and liar; and if he dare unveil himself and avow his name, I will hold him responsible, as I here admit myself to be, to all the laws which govern and regulate the conduct of men of honor.

31st January, 1825. H. CLAY."

Not satisfied with this general challenge, Mr. Clay the following year called Mr. Randolph to the field. There is a clause in the constitution, that constitution which both Messrs. Adams and Clay had sworn to defend and maintain, which says that, members shall not be held responsible for words spoken in debate. Mr. Clay, however, found it convenient to set this clause aside—Mr. Randolph had justly censured him in the Senate, and is held responsible therefor. We will not stop at this time to compare the high minded and honorable conduct of the Virginia Senator, who suffered himself to be the mark of the Secretary of State without returning his fire—with that of the irritable and excited Mr. Clay. The whole fighting part of the duel was performed by Mr. Clay, and Mr. Adams approves his conduct, still retains him as Secretary, and makes common cause with him. Who after this can say that Mr. Adams is opposed to the principle or practice of duelling?

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*, subject to newspaper postage, and *no more*.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 18, 1828. No. 32

HENRY CLAY AND THE BARGAIN.

A *new view* of the *old story* of the bargain;
"Leaving not *one* loop to hang *one* doubt upon."

"Oh that *one would hear me*—and that *my desire* is, *that the Almighty* would answer me; and *that mine adversary had written a book*."—Job, chap. xxxi. ver. 35.

Mr. Clay has written three books, and made sundry electioneering speeches, under the pretext of vindicating himself against the charge of placing himself in his present office, by means of a bargain with Mr. Adams.

The writer thinks that the contents of these books and speeches, connected with certain known and established facts, prove, unquestionably, the reality of that bargain; especially after the new developements made in Mr. Clay's letter to Mr. Blair; the disclosure of the secret bargain with Mr. Cook, and written pledge to Mr. Webster. These papers, connected with other disclosures from Mr. Clay himself, present new aspects, and new colorings to the bargain, which stamp its reality with perfect certainty. The writer has, for a long time, observed with surprise, the lavish waste of pen, ink and paper, in efforts to prove the existence of the bargain by the evidence of others; when he thinks that fact has been undeniably proved by Mr. Clay's own precious confessions. One unfortunate effect, arising from this course of proceeding, has been, to divert the public attention from Mr. Clay's own statements, and to introduce unavailing disputations about the credibility of witnesses, which would be unnecessary were Mr. Clay the sole witness. His evidence, the writer thinks, abundantly sufficient of itself, to prove the reality of the bargain; and to prove much more!!! That Mr. Clay stooped to employ deception, perfidy, duplicity, contradiction and intrigue, as instruments for effecting the bargain!!! The writer thinks that this deeply interesting subject loudly calls for every view of it, which may serve to elicit the truth; and in obedience to his sense of duty to the public, he will proceed to perform that task. This shall be done, by a simple analysis of the contents of Mr. Clay's own evidence; regardless of its just influence upon Mr. Clay's own standing in society. The writer will take care to avoid the possibility of doing injustice to Mr. Clay, by presenting the evidence in Mr. Clay's own words; so that, if he should unintentionally have done an injury to Mr. Clay in his construction of the evidence, he will, at the same time, furnish the public with the means of correction. But whilst nothing could shock the writer more, than doing an act of injustice to any human being, he is not at all apprehensive of having it in his power to do any to Mr. Clay, if he would. Mr. Clay has made the public avowal, that he will employ his official patronage to the utmost, for the promotion of his own objects. This influence is chiefly exerted over the press; and is found to be so great upon his dependants of the type, that the moment he is attacked, thousands of goose quills fly to his relief; but the writer confidently puts at defiance, all the goose quills of the nation in attempting to relieve Mr. Clay from the many entanglements he has incautiously thrown upon himself, by means of his voluminous publications. Mr. Clay addresses his first book to his constituents, on the 25th of March 1825, from which the following is an extract:

"It is known to you, that my name had been presented, by the respectable States of Ohio, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Missouri, for the office of President, to the consideration of the American public, and that it had attracted some attention in other quarters of the Union. When, early in November last, I took my departure from the district to repair to this city, the issue of the Presidential election before the people was unknown. Events, however, had then so far transpired as to render it highly probable that there would be no election by the people, and that I should be excluded from the House of Representatives. It became, therefore, my duty to consider, and to make up an opinion on the respective pretensions of the three gentlemen that might be returned; and at that early period I stated to Dr Drake, one of the Professors in the Medical School of Transylvania University, and to John J. Crittenden, Esq. of Frankfort, my determination to support Mr. Adams in preference to Gen. Jackson. I wrote to Charles Hammond, Esq. of Cincinnati, about the same time, and mentioned certain objections to the election of Mr. Crawford, (among which was that of his continued ill health,) that appeared to me almost insuperable. During my journey hither, and up to near Christmas, it remained uncertain whether Mr. Crawford or I would be returned to the House of Representatives. Up to near Christmas, all our information made it highly probable that the vote of Louisiana would be given to me, and that I should consequently be returned, to the exclusion of Mr. Crawford. And, whilst that probability was strong, I communicated to Mr. Senator Johnston, of Louisiana, my resolution not to allow my name, in consequence of the small number of votes by which it would be carried into the House, if I were returned, to constitute an obstacle, for one moment, to an election in the House of Representatives."

The most superficial reader, cannot but observe, that in this quotation, Mr. Clay suggests two *incompatible probabilities*, in relation to an unknown event, existing at the same time; and each probability, at the same time, formed a motive for Mr. Clay's contradictory conduct. The one probability was, that early in November, 1824, events had transpired, which rendered it "highly probable" that Mr. Clay would be excluded from the House of Representatives by the votes of the electoral colleges. The other was, that, at the time, and nearly up to Christmas, the same events had rendered it

highly probable, that the same Mr. Clay, would not be excluded from the House of Representatives by the same electoral votes. Here, then, are presented, two "high probabilities," existing at the same time in relation to the same event; and each "high probability," in spite of its antagonist "high probability," is asserted by Mr. Clay, to form a motive with him for his conduct at the same moment. What could be expected from Mr. Clay's conduct, grounded upon contradictory probabilities, existing at the same time, but contradictions and absurdities? The writer will despatch, at once, his examination of the conduct, which Mr. Clay had peremptorily marked out for his observance upon the occurrence of the second "high probability," which was then stronger than its antagonist, and continued to grow stronger, until the 20th of December, 1824, that Mr. Clay would not be excluded from the House of Representatives. In that event, Mr. Clay says; "whilst that probability was strong, I communicated to Mr. Senator Johnston, of Louisiana, my resolution, not to allow my name, in consequence of the small number of votes by which it would be carried into the House, if I were returned, to constitute an obstacle, for one moment, to an election in the House of Representatives." Wonderful resolution!!! Platonic, beyond all belief!! Why would you not, Mr. Clay, allow your name to constitute an obstacle, for one moment, to an election in the House of Representatives? Answer—in Mr. Clay's own words: "in consequence of the small number of votes by which it would be carried into the House." Mr. Clay here voluntarily excludes himself from the benefit which would have accrued to him, if brought into the House of Representatives, in consequence of the very great plurality of votes given to two of his competitors, over himself; grounding his positive exclusion solely upon the principles of plurality, in the *degree of disparity* between the competitors. Could any thing be more pure, patriotic, and platonic!!! A perfect political phenomenon, in these degenerate days!!! One, strictly "sui generis!" But, wonderful as this claim to purity and immaculacy is, Mr. Clay's greater liberality to one of his competitors, is still more wonderful!!! Whilst his own platonism applies the principle of exclusion positively to himself, his liberality induced him to apply it only argumentatively to one of his least favored competitors; and that is done, under circumstances more unfavorable to that one than to himself. How many votes brought Mr. Crawford into the House?—41. How many votes would have brought Mr. Clay into the House, if he had secured the votes of Louisiana?—42. Yet Mr. Clay professes to make a principle, arising solely from the small number of votes which would have been given to him, positive, in relation to himself, and applies the principle only partially to Mr. Crawford, having 41 votes.

Hear Mr. Clay's reasonings upon this principle in his own words:

"The first inquiry which it behooved me to make was, [after the 20th Dec. 1824,] as to the influence which ought to be exerted on my judgment, by the relative state of the electoral votes, which the three returned candidates brought into the House, from the colleges.—General Jackson obtained 99, Mr. Adams 84, and Mr. Crawford 41. Ought the fact of a plurality being given to one of the candidates to have any, and what, weight? If the Constitution had intended that it should have been *decisive*, the Constitution would have made it *decisive*, and interdicted the exercise of any discretion on the part of the House of Representatives. The Constitution has not so ordained; but, on the contrary, it has provided, that "from the persons having the highest numbers, not exceeding three, on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall *choose*, immediately, by ballot, a President." Thus, a discretion is necessarily invested in the House, for choice implies examination, comparison, judgment. The fact, therefore, that one of the three persons was the highest returned, not being, by the constitution of the country, *conclusive* upon the judgment of the House, it still remains to determine what is the true degree of weight belonging to it?"

Mr. Clay most platonically makes the degree of disparity which could justify a positive exclusion, in his own case, 42 to 84—99; and most liberally refuses to make the principle of exclusion positive, in the case of Mr. Crawford, upon a disparity of 41 to 84—99 votes. Besides, Mr. Clay's reasoning goes to show conclusively, that no disparity of numbers would justify the principle of positive exclusion. Why, then, voluntarily make the principle of exclusion positive, in relation to himself, and not to Mr. Crawford? And whence all the anxiety manifested by Mr. Clay himself, that he should be brought into the House, when his own resolution to exclude himself, if brought in upon a small number of votes, put him in a worse condition, than if he had been excluded by the electoral colleges? For, in the one case, he would have been excluded from a vote between the other competitors; in the other, he would not; and the manner he did exercise his right to vote, incontestibly proves the high value he put upon the right itself. But hear his own reasoning in relation to Mr. Crawford, in his own words:

"For Mr. Crawford, who barely entered the House, with only four votes more than one candidate not returned, and upon whose case, therefore, the argument derived from the fact of plurality, *operated with strong, though not decisive force, I have ever felt much personal regard.* But I was called upon to perform a solemn public duty, in which my private feelings, whether of affection or aversion, were not to be indulged, *but the good of my country only consulted.* It appeared to me that the precarious state of that gentleman's health, although I participated with his best friends, in all their regrets and sympathies, on account of it, was conclusive against him, to say nothing of other considerations, of a public nature, which would have deserved examination, if happily, in that respect, he had been differently circumstanced. He had been ill near eighteen months; and although I am aware that his actual condition was a fact depending upon evidence, and that the evidence in regard to it, which had been presented to the public, was not perfectly harmonious, I judged for myself upon what I saw and heard. He may, and I ardently hope, will, recover; but I did not think it became me to assist in committing the Executive administration

of this great Republic on the doubtful contingency of the restoration to health of a gentleman who had been so long and so seriously afflicted."

If Mr. Clay had made the principle of exclusion positive in relation to Mr. Crawford, as he did in relation to himself, all inquiry about his health, qualities, or qualifications, would have been wholly unnecessary. He would have been previously excluded from the small number of votes which carried him into the House. The principle of exclusion being the same in its application to both, its refusal to Mr. Crawford, could only have been founded on personal considerations—That Mr. Clay actually loved Mr. Crawford more dearly than he did himself!!! Would not that be wonderful? Is it not absolutely incredible, when, upon every other occasion of his life, Mr. Clay, it is thought, presents himself the most devoted egotist upon earth? The letter "I" is the most favorite one in the whole alphabet, with Mr. Clay. It is fortunate for him, that it is a monosyllable, and occupies little more space than a right line, otherwise, its frequent use would add greatly to Mr. Clay's labors, in his voluminous writings. The writer believes, from long and frequent observation, the favorite letter "I," occurs oftener in Mr. Clay's writings, than those of any other writer who ever wielded a pen to the same extent. Under what circumstances was this platonic resolution communicated to Mr. Senator Johnston? It was when "every probability" was in favor of the happening of the event of Mr. Clay's being returned to the House—which would test Mr. Clay's sincerity in his platonic professions. Here Mr. Clay's resolution was positive, not to let his name constitute an obstacle, for one moment, to an election by the House! But in Mr. Clay's second book—Dec. 1827—he seems to be under an impression that he had carried his platonism too far; and he again introduces the subject, as if to show there was some latent mental reservation, which would be inconsistent with such positive resolution.

Mr. Clay says—"I stated in my address to my constituents, that if I had received the vote of Louisiana, and become one of the three candidates returned, I had *resolved* at a time when there was '*every probability*' of my receiving it, that I would not allow my name, in consequence of the small number of votes by which it would be carried into the House, if I was returned, to *constitute an obstacle to an election*." Mr. Johnston says—"You replied, that you would not permit the country to be disturbed a day on your account; that you would not allow your name to interfere with the prompt decision of the question."

Here seems to be some intimation, that Mr. Clay did not mean to apply the principle of positive exclusion to himself, in the event of his getting the vote of the House, by general acclamation; but merely that he would not permit the country to be disturbed on his account. If such were Mr. Clay's secret reliance, it completely takes away all its boasted platonism, and renders his professions to his friend Johnston perfidious in the highest degree. It will be seen here, how sweetly his bosom friend chimes in with Mr. Clay for his explanatory object. Treble and tenor—most harmoniously symphonizing—this (base) enough symphonizing with both.

This communication was made to Mr. Senator Johnston, when every anxiety was manifested by Mr. Clay, to be returned to the House, and when, if he adhered to his positive platonic resolution, he would have put himself into a worse condition, in relation to his influence in the election, than if he were excluded by the electoral vote. Whence, then, the anxiety not to be excluded?

It was made when there was a general impression more strongly perhaps upon Mr. Clay's mind, than on that of any other person's, that if he were returned to the House in any way—by book or by crook—he would be elected to the Presidency by the partial favor of the House. Mr. Clay describes his impressions in that respect in the following words:

"During the month of December, and the greater part of January, strong professions of high consideration, and of unbounded admiration of *me*, were made to *my* friends, in the greatest profusion, by some of the active friends of all the returned candidates. Every body professed to regret, after *I* was excluded from the House, that *I* had not been returned to it. *I* seemed to be the favorite of every body. Describing *my* situation to a distant friend, *I* said to him, '*I* am enjoying, whilst alive, the posthumous honors which are usually awarded to the venerated dead.'

"A person not acquainted with human nature, would have been surprised, in listening to these praises, that the object of them had not been elected by *general acclamation*. None made more or warmer manifestations of these sentiments of esteem and admiration, than some of the friends of General Jackson. None were so reserved as those of Mr. Adams; under an opinion, (as *I* have learnt since the election,) which they early imbibed, that the western vote would be only influenced by its own sense of public duty; and that if its judgment pointed to any other than Mr. Adams, nothing which they could do would secure it to him. These professions and manifestations were taken by *me* for what they were worth. *I* knew that the sunbeams would quickly disappear, after *my* opinion should be ascertained, and that they would be succeeded by a storm; although *I* did not foresee exactly how it would burst upon *my* poor head. *I* found myself transformed from a candidate before the people, into an elector for the people. *I* deliberately examined the duties incident to this new attitude, and weighed all the facts before *me*, upon which *my* judgement was to be formed or reviewed. If the eagerness of any of the heated partisans of the respective candidates suggested a tardiness in the declaration of *my* intention, *I* believed that the new relation, in which *I* was placed to the subject imposed on *me* an obligation to pay some respect to delicacy and decorum." (*I*—*me*—or *my*—twenty-one times in this quotation.) Egotism enough!

Under these circumstances, is there one human being who can believe in the sincerity of Mr. Clay's positive resolution to exclude himself from an election by the House, when his election to the Presidency by that House was thought to be certain? An election which would have consummated all the fond hopes

of Mr. Clay's extravagant imagination, and afforded him full compensation for all the anxious intrigues of his laborious days, and sleepless nights! All to be sacrificed without cause, except the pure gratification of Mr. Clay's disinterested patriotism! And how do all these platonic sensibilities and patriotic professions comport with the following expressions of Mr. Clay's anxiety to be brought into the House, in which event, his election to the Presidency would have been rendered certain, no matter with what associates; and his urgent recommendation to his friends to persevere in bringing him into the House? The following is an extract from Mr. Clay to Mr. Kendal, recently brought to light. Mr. Kendall says:

"I find in one of your letters, dated Washington, 18th March, 1824, a remark which I do not understand, unless there was then some understanding or some prospect of one, between you and Mr. Adams. You say:

"New York continues to be a contested State. My decided opinion is, that it will give its support to Mr. Adams or to me, or perhaps divide it between us. In that case, Mr. Crawford cannot come into the House. My friends are confident in the belief, that if I enter the House as one of the three highest, no matter with what associates, I shall be elected. If, contrary to all probability, Mr. Crawford should obtain the vote of New York, the contest for an entry into the House will probably be between Jackson and me."—"Without entering into further particulars, my opinion is, that my friends have every motive for vigorous, animated, and persevering exertion."

Under these circumstances, it is not possible for any human being of sound mind to believe Mr. Clay's platonic, patriotic professions. If not—if his sincerity be utterly discredited, does not his avowal to Mr. Senator Johnston before the event, and his disclosure to the public after the event even after writing this letter to his friend, Mr. Kendall, present an unparalleled example of duplicity, perfidy, and hypocrisy, first towards his bosom friend, and through him, towards the public!!! No! It is believed Mr. Clay's case is not unparalleled. A parallel one may be found in Mr. Adams's solemn declaration to the American people; that it was actually his wish to set aside his own election to the Presidency, and to submit it again to the decision of the people.

Hear him, in his own words!

"Mr. Adams positively, and unequivocally asserts, in substance, that in consequence of all his predecessors in the high station to which the selection of the *House had called him*, having had a majority of the votes of the primary electoral suffrages, whilst it had fallen to his lot to have a minority of votes; and still worse, one of his competitors for the office having even a greater minority than himself, "he should not hesitate to decline the acceptance of the eminent charge, and to submit the decision of this momentous question again to the determination of the people, provided his refusal to accept the trust delegated to him, would give an immediate opportunity to the people to form, and to express, with a nearer approach to unanimity, the object of their preference."

An election, which had been secured by a very small majority of votes, and [illegible] by Mr. Adams! His bargain with Clay, now reduced to a certainty—his written pledge to Webster.

Was there ever before an exhibition of two more consummate Machiavals in political morals than the one here presented in the persons of Messrs. Adams and Clay? Were there ever more shallow, unblushing artifices and practices, than those chosen by the Machiavals for the manifestation of their political morals? Are these two unprincipled Machiavals to be elected by the free voice of the American people? The one their President!!! The other their Secretary of State!!! Oh! shame!!! Worse than Sodom and Gomorrah of old!!! Cannot two honest men be found to save this great youthful nation? But this is the least important examination of Mr. Clay's preposterous, deceptive disclosures, and ridiculous prevarications. Look at his declared course of conduct, and his motives for it, as well before as after the happening of the *first high probability*. The first observation, which occurs in the examination of Mr. Clay's course of conduct, under the *first* high probability, that Mr. Clay would be excluded from the House, is his preposterous attempt to prove 'the publicity of a fact,' against 'public notoriety.' Mr. Clay undertakes to prove, that early in Oct. 1824, he had declared his unchangeable determination substantially to vote for Mr. Adams; and he does prove by some ton, or a dozen, of his symphonizing compurgators, that he had apprized them of that fixed determination; but he does not prove by any one of them; that he made the communication with the intent to have it made public, nor that, in fact, it was made public; but merely with an intent to his friends, private gratification. This is sufficiently obvious, from the fact, that each of his friends kept the sacred deposite to himself, and did not gratify the public anxious curiosity with the information intrusted to him by Mr. Clay. Amongst other witnesses, Mr. Clay has taken the trouble to send to France, for the purpose of introducing General Lafayette, as one of his witnesses; but Lafayette proves *positively*, that the information disclosed to him was *to a private, and not a public interest*, and was considered confidential by him. This communication was made about the last of December, 1824: Mr. Clay has taken great pains to prove, that it was after the 20th of December, 1824.

There seems to have been a confusion of ideas, and of blundering contradictions, on the part of Mr. Clay in this transaction, that is absolutely unaccountable, upon the supposition of the ordinary exercise of Mr. Clay's mental faculties. Whilst his object is to prove that as early as October, 1824, he had communicated to some chosen friends a fact, with an intent to have it made public through them, he calls upon Gen. Lafayette to prove, that Mr. Clay communicated the same fact to him, *in confidence*, after the 20th of December, 1824!!! Confidence is the antipodes of publicity; and proves, not only that the fact was not public, but not intended to be made public by Mr. Clay, as late as 20th Dec. 1824. Here, then, Mr. Clay's proof fails him entirely in regard to his undisguised publicity of a fact in Oct. 1824, which he considered as confidential after the 20th of Dec. 1824. For a confidential communication of a fact of publicity [illegible] is a solecism in its self—besides

the public anxiety to be informed of that very fact, is now, and was then, matter of public notoriety; and this public notoriety, Mr. Clay has the preposterous hardihood to attempt to disprove by his symphonizing compurgators.

But as this is really a matter of curiosity, as well as of interest, hear the evidence as given by Mr. Clay himself, and Gen. Lafayette.

Extract from Mr. Clay's address to his constituents.

"And at *that early period*, (the early part of Nov. 1829,) I stated to Dr. Drake, one of the Professors in the Medical School of Transylvania University, and to John J. Crittenden, Esq. of Frankfort, my determination to support Mr. Adams in preference to Gen. Jackson. I wrote to Charles Hammond, Esq. of Cincinnati, about the same time, and mentioned certain objections to the election of Mr. Crawford, (among which was that of his continued ill-health,) that appeared *almost insuperable*. During my journey hither, and up to near Christmas, it remained uncertain whether Mr. Crawford or I would be returned to the House of Representatives. Up to near Christmas, all our information made it high probable that the vote of Louisiana would be given to me, and that I should consequently be returned to the exclusion of Mr. Crawford."

Extract from Mr. Clay's address, Dec. 1827.

"This testimony establishes, that on various occasions and times, beginning in Kentucky as early as about the 1st October, 1824, and continued in the City of Washington down to the period when my determination to vote for Mr. Adams was generally known in this City, I uniformly expressed my conviction of Gen. Jackson's want of qualification, and my fixed resolution not to vote for him, if I were called upon to give a vote. These sentiments, long cherished, were deliberately expressed to gentlemen of the highest respectability, most of them my personal and particular friends, in all of whose estimation I must have stood dishonored, if I had voted for Gen. Jackson, contrarily to my declared purpose. This purpose was avowed immediately preceding my departure from Kentucky to attend Congress, and immediately on my arrival here, after the termination of the journey. David Trimble Esq. states that about the first of October, 1824, he held a conversation with me at Frankfort, in Kentucky, on the subject and prospects of the pending election, which he details minutely, and that in the course of it, I said: "that I could not, consistently with my principles, vote for Gen. Jackson, under any possible circumstances."

Extract from General Lafayette's letter to Mr. Clay.

"My remembrance concurs with your own on this point, that in the *latter end of December*, either before or after my visit to Annapolis, you being out of the Presidential candidature, after having expressed my above-mentioned motives of forbearance, I, by way of a confidential exception, allowed myself to put a simple unqualified question respecting your electioneering guess, and your intended vote: your answer was, that, in your opinion, the actual state of health of Mr. Crawford had limited the contest to a choice between Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson; that a claim founded on military achievements did not meet your preference; and that you had concluded to vote for Mr. Adams. Such has been, if not the literal wording, at least the precise sense of a conversation which it would have been inconsistent for me to carry any farther, *and not to keep a secret*, while a recollection of it to assist your memory, I should not now deny, not only to you, no, my friend, but to any man in a similar situation."

Here then is seen Gen. Lafayette's statement, that the communication made to him after the 20th December, 1824, was confidential, and by him kept secret.

Mr. Clay himself declares:

Extract from Mr. Clay's pamphlet, of Dec. 1827.

"It was the policy with which the political campaign was conducted in the winter of 1824, '25, by the forces of the General, in the first instance to practise stratagem with my friends and me. Accordingly the arts of persuasion and flattery were employed. But as I did not hasten to give in my adhesion, and remained most mysteriously silent; in other words, had not converted myself into a boisterous and zealous partisan of Gen. J., it became necessary to change that policy, and to substitute intimidation for blandishment."

Mr. Clay's proof, so far as it was intended to make an impression of his having fairly and openly declared his determination to vote for Mr. Adams from October, and even after his arrival at Washington, again completely fails him; and his proof of his making that declaration for individual gratification, can be of no service to him whatever. Besides, if in fact he had so made up his mind unchangeably to vote for Mr. Adams, as early as October, it was the plain and obvious dictate of duty, frankly and honestly to have said so to the public, and not to some few friends only—not to remain "most mysteriously silent," during the winter of 1824, '25. Hear Mr. Clay again, in contradiction of himself:

Extract from his 2d Book, 1827.

"I challenge the production of such a paper; I do not believe my intention to vote for Mr. Adams was announced in the newspapers openly and avowedly during the whole month of January, or at any rate, until late in the month. The only avowal of my intention to vote for him, which was publicly, made in the newspapers prior to the election, is contained in my letter to Judge Brooke, which is dated the 28th of January. It was first published in the Enquirer at Richmond, some time in the ensuing month. I go farther: I do not believe any newspaper at Washington can be produced announcing before the latter part of January the fact, whether upon my avowal or not, of my intention to vote for Mr. Adams!!"

Could any thing short of lunar influence, or lucid intervals account for Mr. Clay's defiance to the world to show that his intention to vote for Mr. Adams had appeared in the newspapers before the last of January, 1825, when he had taken so much testimony to prove, and so strenuously insisted upon his having given that very intention publicity, as early as the 1st of October, 1824?

Still worse: Mr. Clay persevered in this culpable, "most mysterious silence," being perfectly compatible with his defiance, to show

that his intention appeared in the newspapers till the last of January, or beginning of February, 1825; perfectly incompatible with his frank disclosure of the same intention, made as early as October, 1824, with a full knowledge of its deprecated consequences to himself. He says:

"I knew that the sunbeams would quickly disappear after my opinions should be ascertained, and that they would be succeeded by a storm."

This most infatuated declaration proves, at once, that Mr. Clay well knew he had concealed from the public his determination to vote for Mr. Adams, under any circumstances which could possibly take place, if, indeed, he had determined, it being clear that he had not, and a conscious conviction that he was doing wrong in preserving the "most mysterious silence" upon a matter which he ought frankly and openly to have communicated to the public; and which, if done, would have relieved him in a moment from all the consequences of the storm he then anticipated—all the horrible effects of which storm Mr. Clay was willing to encounter for the prize he had in view, although he could not tell how it would "burst over his poor head." All this vast parade of proofs, then, ushered forth to the public, when fairly analyzed, goes only to show, that Mr. Clay told some of his symphonizing compurgators, under the spell of confidence, that he had conclusively made up his determination to vote for Mr. Adams, from the early part of October to the last of December, 1824, and even up to the time of actually giving the vote. But this is no proof whatever, that Mr. Clay's mind was unalterably fixed in its purpose. It proves only, that he *told* his friends it was. That by no means proves that it was so in fact. Mr. Clay proves positively and unequivocally himself, that it was not so fixed in fact; and describes his state of mind to be absolutely incompatible with that fixed determination.

Hear him, in his own words:

"I found myself transformed from a candidate before the people, into an elector for the people. (Hinc illæ lachrymæ.) I deliberately examined the duties incident to this new attitude, and weighed all the facts before me upon which my judgement was to be formed, or renewed." When did this most deplorable disclosure take place? 20th Dec., 1824, by the annunciation of the vote of Louisiana through Mr. Senator Bouligny. What were the instant effects of this disclosure?

First, it converted Mr. Clay from a candidate before the people, into an elector for the people. Second, this new attitude imposed new duties upon Mr. Clay. What were these new duties, incident to this new attitude, deliberately to be examined by Mr. Clay? They were, to weigh all the facts before him, upon which his judgement in the Presidential election was to be formed, or reviewed. All this was to be done after the 20th Dec., 1824, and of course could not have been irrevocably done, before that time. Is this not proof positive by Mr. Clay himself, that he had not, in fact, and in truth, unalterably made up his mind, nearly to the 1st of October, to vote for Mr. Adams. Is not the state of mind here described absolutely incompatible with a previously fixed determination? What were the duties to be performed by Mr. Clay after the 20th of Dec., 1824? To weigh all the facts before him upon which his judgement was to be, thereafter, formed, or reviewed. Now, if these very duties had been irrevocably performed, as early as the 1st October, 1824, could they remain to be performed after the 20th Dec., 1824? But Mr. Clay tells the public himself, how he proceeded to perform the very duties after his arrival at Washington, which he had irrevocably performed as early as the 1st Oct., preceding. Notwithstanding Mr. Crawford was excluded, both by the small number of votes which carried him into the House, upon Mr. Clay's principle, applicable to himself, and by Mr. Clay's irrevocable determination to vote for Mr. Adams under any circumstances which could possibly occur; Mr. Clay took Mr. Crawford's case into consideration after his arrival at Washington. He states, in substance, that not willing to trust to rumor, he waited on Mr. Crawford in person, to determine on the state of his health, and found it such as to put him out of the question. His remaining duties to be performed, were, to weigh all the facts before him in relation to Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson's pretensions; and in the discharge of these duties, he remained "most mysteriously silent," in relation to his final determination between them, as well as Mr. Crawford, until his opinions in that respect were generally known in Washington, some time in the latter part of January, or beginning of February, 1825. This duty was equally unnecessary, if his determination had been irrevocably fixed as early as Oct., 1824. Now, in the first place, is not this most mysterious silence, absolutely incompatible with a state of publicity in relation to the objects of it? Does it not prove incontestibly, that Mr. Clay had not given publicity to those objects? Does not his preposterous attempt to prove that he had given them publicity, through his frank communications to his symphonizing compurgators, prove his own convictions that he ought to have made it public? Does not his most mysterious silence prove, that, notwithstanding those communications, he had not irrevocably made up his mind respecting his vote for the Presidency; or if he had, that he did not wish it made public? For if he so wished, why not make it so himself? Is there a human being, who possesses more facilities in giving publicity to any thing he may wish? But in that case, what is to become of the positive evidence of his partial partisans, that he told them, he had so made up his mind? And that he stood pledged to them to carry his determination into effect; or if he failed to do so, he must stand dishonored in their eyes? What a hoax? Where is the difficulty in the solution of these questions? As it regards the first, it only goes to show, that Mr. Clay had so told his symphonizing compurgators; not that it was so in fact, as now proved by himself. Is there any thing miraculous, or even strange, in this? How many stand conspicuous, in his written effusions, now under examination? Perhaps not one half will be introduced here; but only count those which shall be enumerated, and all seeming difficulties on that score will instantly vanish.

still less difficulty will attend the solution of the other difficulty. The only task imposed upon Mr. Clay by his disclosures to his devoted partisans, was to reconcile them to any change he might make in his vote subsequently to these disclosures. Suppose then Mr. Clay had finally, after his long most mysterious silence, voted for Gen Jackson, instead of Mr. Adams; how could he save his honor with his own devoted partisans? The only conceivable object with Mr. Clay, for this most mysterious silence, was to secure to himself the office of Secretary of State. That was the great boon in request, both by himself and friends. Suppose then Mr. Clay had ascertained after these communications, that in the event of Gen. Jackson's election, Mr. Clay would be Secretary of State, where would then have been the difficulty of reconciling them to this change of conduct? Would not Mr. Clay have found complete justification with them, in the assurance that he had secured the great object they had in view' to wit: that in the event of Jackson's election, he would be Secretary of State? Mr. Clay would only have had to say in his justification, that upon full deliberation, after his conversation with them, he had concluded, that it would be better to have a Western President, with a Western Secretary of State, than to have an Eastern President, either with or without a Western Secretary of State; and when, that Eastern President was the most obnoxious personage to the Western people, in the United States, rendered chiefly so by Henry Clay, and his competitor the most popular! Would he not have found much less difficulty in reconciling some dozen sweet symphonizing friends to the arrangement, than he has found in reconciling the Western people with the arrangement he did actually make, against their will, although he did thereby get the great boon for himself and the Western people. Doubtlessly much less. Indeed, by critically examining all Mr. Clay has disclosed upon the subject, it may be clearly seen, he had in that event, already anticipated this ground; and that Mr. Clay, notwithstanding all that passed from him in relation to Gen. Jackson, would nevertheless have voted for Gen. Jackson in preference to Mr. Adams, could he have previously ascertained, that in so doing, he would be Secretary of State; and this for the most obvious reasons; because he would then have effected his object without hazarding his own popularity in the West, which with him was an all-important consideration, whereas, in the daring, hazardous attempt he has made, he has completely and most justly sacrificed his own standing in the West. It is perfectly clear, that Mr. Clay apprehended a storm from the West, in consequence of the course he pursued for his own promotion; and that he did not decide upon it until after the disclosure made by Mr. Buchanan, of the honorable refusal of Gen. Jackson to compromit himself in any respect whatever; and then evidently in a state of trepidation and reluctance; for he says, it must be presumed, in consequence of this most hazardous enterprize, he anticipated the most horrible storm "would burst over his poor head." There is no doubt but that Mr. Clay thought then, that it would be much easier to reconcile his most partial friends to his voting for General Jackson, than to reconcile the Western people to his voting for Mr. Adams; and he knows so now.

Is it possible to divine any other object Mr. Clay could have had in view, by his long, culpable, mysterious silence, but the ascertainment of the hand from which he would most certainly receive the office of Secretary of State? and thus avail himself in future, of the "safe precedent?" What effects were this mysterious silence calculated to have upon the partisans of the different competitors? What effects did it actually have, according to Mr. Clay's own showing? Was it not equivalent in its effects, to an open public advertisement? "Henry Clay up to the highest bidder!" or to a label in large Roman capitals upon his forehead? "Henry Clay to let." A frank, honest disclosure of his intentions in the beginning, must have saved him from all the consequences of his culpable, mysterious silence. The sole object of this mysterious silence was sufficiently obvious before the publication of the substantial contents of Mr. Clay's letter to Mr. Blair. That publication leaves it without a doubt. Hear Mr. Clay upon this most important point:

Extract from Mr. Clay's letter to Mr. Blair, as published by Mr Kendall.

"The Chairman received the note with that suavity and politeness for which he is so justly distinguished, kindly remarking to my friend who bore it, that if the letters had been left in his possession, I should not have had a sight of them—much less a copy; but he finally promised to lay the application before the committee at their next meeting. As I cannot, from the feelings evinced by the Chairman, expect any thing favorable from the deliberations of the committee, I feel compelled to resort to my recollections for the substance of your letter to Mr. Blair.

Let the date be recollected—*it is January 8th*, 1825. You commence by giving Mr. Blair your opinion upon a work by Lord Byron which you say you have sent him—*(franked I presume.)* You then enter into the subject of the Presidential election and say, that the time has now arrived, when you must begin to think seriously for whom you are to vote. You state that the

Extract from Mr. Clay's address to his constituents, April 1, 1825, much at large.

"During the month of December, and the greatest part of January, strong professions of high consideration and unbounded admiration, of *me*, were made to *my* friends, in the greatest profusion, by some of the active friends of all the returned candidates. Every body professed to regret, after *I* was excluded from the House, that *I* had not been returned to it. *I* seemed to be the favorite of every body. Describing *my* situation to a distant friend, *I* said to him, *I* am enjoying, whilst alive, the posthumous honors, which are usually awarded to the venerated dead. A person not acquainted with human nature would have been surprised, in listening to these praises; that the object of them had not been elected by general acclamation. None made more or warmer manifestations of these sentiments of esteem and admiration, than some of the friends of Gen Jackson. None were so reserved as those of Mr. Adams; under an opinion, (as *I* have learnt since the

riends of all the can-
dates entertained the
pinion that on you
sted the decision of
e contest, and that
our situation was sin-
lar and amusing.
ou say that the
iends of the several
andidates accost you
turn; that a friend of
eneral Jackson says
you, my dear sir,
y hopes are upon
ou do not disappoint
s—our partiality was
r you next to the
ero—you know the
xiety we all had for
western President:
hat a friend of Mr.
rawford comes and
ys, the hopes of the
epublican party are
pon you; you and Mr.
rawford were the on-
republican candi-
ates; had you been
eturned to the House,
e should have con-
en'rated our force
pon you. The lan-
uage of Mr. Adams'
iends, you give in
early the following
ords:

"A friend of Mr. Adams comes to me with tears in his eyes' nd says—Sir, Mr. Adams has always had he greatest respect or you and the high-st admiration for your alents. There is no ituation to which you re not equal. You ere undoubtedly the econd choice of New ngland, and I pray ou to consider whe-her the public good nd your own future nterests do not dis-nctly point you to the ourse which you ught to pursue."

election,) which they early imbibed, that the western vote would be only influenced by its own sense of public duty; and that, if its judgement pointed to any other man than Mr. Adams, nothing which they could do would secure it to him. These professions and manifestations were taken by *me* for what they were worth. *I* knew that the sunbeams would quickly disappear, after *my* opinion should be asserted, and that they would be succeeded by a storm; although *I* did not see exactly how it would burst upon *my* poor head. *I* found myself transformed from a candidate before the people, into an elector for the people. *I* deliberately examined the duties incident to this new attitude, and weighed all the facts before *me*, upon which *my* judgement was to be formed, or renewed. If the eagerness of any of the heated partisans of the respective candidates, suggested a tardiness in the declaration of *my* intentions, *I* believed that the new relation, in which *I* was placed to the subject, imposed on *me* an obligation to pay some respect to decency and decorum."

elector for the people?—In his letter to Mr. Blair, Mr. Clay says: "The time is now arrived, when he must begin to think seriously for whom he is to vote." Strange! that Mr. Clay should not till then (8th Jan. 1825,) begin to think seriously for whom he should vote; since he has asserted, and proved positively, by his symphonizing compurgators, that he told them, he had irrevocably determined, as early as October 1824 to vote for Mr. Adams; and that he had openly, and frankly told his friends so, with a view to its publicity, if the communication be at all available for his object, both before, and after he had reached Washington, (winter of 1824—'25.) If these facts had really been so, whence the trouble and anxiety of weighing all the facts before him, to ascertain for whom he should vote after the 20th December 1824? and after it had been ascertained that he was most unexpectedly excluded from the House? Surely Mr. Clay himself must, upon this review, acknowledge that he is entangled in an inextricable web, spread by himself. But the essential differences consist in the recitals of the different overtures made to Mr. Clay by the partisans of the different competitors. In relation to those made by the friends of Mr. Crawford, and Gen. Jackson, it is necessary only to remark; that in his, Blair's letter, they contain nothing dishonorable; whilst the overtures made by Mr. Adams' friends contain the pith, and substance of the subsequent bargain. Mr. Clay says: "a friend of Mr Adams comes to me "with tears in his eyes" and says: "Sir! Mr. Adams always had the highest respect for you, and the highest admiration of your talents; *there is no situation to which you are not equal;* you are undoubtedly the second choice of New England, and I pray you to consider whether the public good, and your own future interests do not distinctly point out, the course you ought to pursue?" Can there be a clearer indication of a quid pro quo suggested to the option of Mr. Clay? In his address to his constituents, Mr. Clay says: "These professions and manifestations were taken by me for what they were worth." This is almost the only truth Mr. Clay tells his constituents in relation to the overtures made him; and this has every appearance of a "lapsus linguæ." Mr. Clay seems perfectly to have understood their worth respectively.

Those of Jackson, or Crawford, being merely complimentary, were not worth a cent. Those, from Mr. Adams, were worth the Presidency to him, and to Mr. Clay, the office of Secretary of State; the one, the consideration of the other; and Mr. Clay seems to have accepted the overture with avidity, after having fully ascertained that Jackson would not traffic. Here then, is a picture drawn in his letter to Mr. Blair, by Mr. Clay himself. Look now at its contrast, as drawn by Mr. Clay for his constituents? "None were so reserved as those of Mr. Adams, under an opinion (as I have learnt since the election) which they early imbibed, that the Western vote, would be only influenced by its own sense of public duty; and that if its judgment pointed to any other, than Mr. Adams, nothing which they could do, would secure it to him." Look upon this invented picture of human deformity; and weep over [illegible]

The difference in the substance, manner, and spirit of these two recitals, must strike the attention of the most superficial observer;—the most prominent and operative of them only, shall be introduced here. The letter to Mr. Blair was written before the election, and prospectively for it. (8th Jan. 1825.) The address to Mr. Clay's constituents after the election, exclusively of his motives for his vote, and confirst in the election (March 1825.) The recitals agree substantially; that after it was ascertained, that Mr. Clay was excluded from the House (20th Dec. 1824,) new duties devolved upon Mr. Clay, arising from his change of attitude, towards the people: being transformed from a candidate before the people into an

evidence of a made up tale, and a clearer detection of a more unprincipled attempt at deception!!! Is it possible after all these detections, this most unfortunate man can be kept up much longer in his bold, unblushing career, in the manifestation of his public vices, and private immoralities!!! But perhaps objections may be made to the introduction of Mr. Clay's letter to Mr. Blair, through the representation of Mr. Kendall, as a departure from the original promise to prove the bargain, by Mr. Clay's own evidence. Such objections, if made, will be shown to be without the shadow of pretext by Mr. Clay himself. Mr. Clay admits the existence of such a letter to Mr. Blair, but refuses to have it made public. He admits a copy of it, is placed in the hands of the Adams Central committee of Kentucky; and that the committee are at liberty to show the copy to any gentleman, who would call on them for the purpose of inspecting it. Mr. Kendall in compliance with this permission called on the committee for an inspection of the copy; and makes his statement to the public from the same copy, under marks of quotation upon this point; and pledges himself to the public; that it is substantially correct—Mr. Clay states, that he is in possession of another copy of his original letter to Mr. Blair, and declares his readiness to show it to any gentleman who shall apply for the purpose of inspecting it—hitherto, neither, Mr. Clay's committee, nor himself, has denied the correctness of Mr. Kendall's statement—It is known to be a fixed rule of law; in case a party shall be proved to be in possession of any writing, which he refuses to produce, that any representation made of the contents of such writing, shall be construed most strongly against the party withholding or concealing it: —because, it is at all times in his power to relieve himself from any possible injury arising from misconstruction, by the production of the writing itself. This rule, so fair and just in ordinary cases, applies with accumulated force in the case of Mr. Clay. This same rule applies also in full force to the written pledge given to Mr. Webster. Hear Mr. Clay's own admissions in the case, and his most quisical, fallacious reasons for refusing publicity to the letter.

"My correspondence with that gentleman, was friendly and familiar, and sometimes, sportive. It is characterized by a freedom of language, which is occasionally admissible in private and friendly intercourse; but which would not be decorous towards the public. Mr. Blair has himself refused to exhibit the letter in question, or to testify concerning its contents; upon the principle that he will not voluntarily consent to the violation of private correspondence. That principle must command the respect of all honorable men. So far as it guards the charge against me, the publication would benefit, instead of injuring me. Such is the opinion of several gentlemen to whom I have shown the correspondence, and such is my own. But I will not avail myself of this advantage, at the sacrifice of principle, the preservation of which, is a necessary guarantee to social confidence and intercourse. I could not moreover publish my own letters to Mr. Blair, without some of his, showing the sense in which he understood me. Although he has given me permission to publish both, he thinks they ought not to be published; and I will not be the defiance of a profligate editor be the first to set a mischievous example, which the other party to the correspondence has refused to establish. I must decline therefore authorizing the publication of our correspondence. But the Central Committee are at liberty to exhibit to the inspection of any gentleman of any party, all such portions of it, as relate to the Presidential election, and I will do the same upon any such application being made to me."

Here then, Mr. Clay admits the possession of a copy of the original letter, both by himself, and the Central Committee, and neither the one nor the other has contradicted Mr. Kendal's statement, which, he pledges himself, to be expressed in terms, not so strong against Mr. Clay, as the terms contained in the copy, from which it is made. Surely, the letter being from Mr. Clay himself, and the contents not denied, nor published by Mr. Clay, the evidence is strictly, Mr Clay's own evidence. But pray, reader, attend to the miserable, silly quibbles, and artifices, which Mr. Clay brings forward, to justify his refusal to publish the letter. Mr. Clay's claims to credit, for his platonic self-denial to publish the letter, when its publication would be to his advantage, are ludicrous enough, for if the contents of the letter, bear the least resemblance to the contents of Mr. Kendal's statement, is there a man in the world credulous enough, to believe that Mr Clay, or his most partial partizan, can think their publication would be any advantage to Mr. Clay, in any respect whatever? But why is it, Mr. Clay, that you will thus most generously forego the advantage to yourself, attendant upon its publication? Pray, hear him, in his own words—

"But I will not avail myself of the advantage at the sacrifice of principle, the preservation of which, is a necessary guarantee to social confidence and intercourse." How considerate!! How liberal!! How generous, to society!! How pure!! How disinterested!! How cruel, to himself!! What principle is it, Mr. Clay, that you hold so sacred, that you would suffer political martyrdom, rather than violate? It is a principle laid down by Mr. Blair, for his observance—to wit: "That he will not voluntarily consent to a violation of private correspondence!" A most sacred principle, it is true; but it is a principle, not bearing the real relation to Mr. Clay's own case. The principle applicable to Mr. Clay's own case, is not Will you voluntarily consent to a publication of Mr. Blair's correspondence against his will? There is no such demand made on Mr. Clay; but will you consent to have your own letters to Mr. Blair made public? Consenting to this principle, could be no violation of the principle laid down by Mr. Blair—it is a mere request, made to Mr. Clay, to take the liberty with himself, to have his own letter to Mr. Blair made public. It is believed, this might be readily done, without the least hazard to "social confidence and intercourse." Besides; Mr. Blair presents Mr. Clay with this honorable principle, which is strictly applicable to Mr. Clay's own case, whilst the other honorable principle is not. Mr. Clay says, "Mr. Blair has given me permission to publish both, to wit, Mr. Clay's and Mr. Blair's letters. Is there any thing dishonorable in this permission? Does

it contain any thing so alarming and dishonorable, that a compliance with it, would hazard all "social confidence and intercourse"? Yet this is the case which is exactly applicable to Mr Clay's case. Mr. Blair honorably consents to have his own letters to Mr. Clay published—why will not Mr. Clay follow his honorable example, in consenting to have his own letters to Mr. Blair made public? Surely he could do this without any violation of "social confidence or intercourse." That this is all that ever has been requested of Mr. Clay. Will you consent to have your own letters to Mr. Blair made public? Not, will you consent to publish Mr. Blair's letters to you against his will? Mr Blair has honorably consented to have his letters to Mr. Clay made public. Far from following this honorable example, strictly applicable to Mr Clay's case, he dishonorably refused to follow this honorable example, and founds the justification of his refusal, upon his approbation of another honorable principle, observed by Mr. Blair. This refusal to publish Mr Clay's letter to him, against Mr. Clay's will; which is in no respect whatever, applicable to Mr. Clay's case, and of course, no possible justification of his refusal to give publicity to his letters to Mr. Blair, all the subtleties and artifices employed by Mr. Clay in disguising his real motitives for his refusal to consent to the publication of his letters to Mr. Blair, consits simply, in the attempt to shift the question, the chief art employed by Mr. Clay, in all his superficial, fallacious, deceptive reasonings. What vanity, what egotism, is here displayed by Mr. Clay! What disrespect, what contempt for the understandings of the people. After all, how rash, how weak, how superficial, how contemeptible are all these shifts subtilties, and inventions. The whole evidence of the overtures made to Mr. Clay by Mr. Adams, or his partisans, "with tears in their eyes," is now in review, at one glance. What has been the result, as proven by Mr. Clay himself? In Mr. Clay's electioneering dinner speech at Pittsburg, he makes the following assertions and "precious confessions."

"I have differed only once with Pennsylvania, and that was a difference in relation to men, not measures. It was not among the most inconsiderable reasons which induced me on that occasion to make the selection which I did, that I thought the measures which Pennsylvania approved, would be safe under the administration of our present Chief Magistrate. I knew his opinions, and I have not been disappointed. I did not certainly know the opinions of his great rival. I had my fears, and succeeding events have not been of a nature to quiet them." What have we here? "Precious confessions," indeed? These "precious confessions" demonstratively prove, that all the overtures made by Mr. Adams's supplicators to Mr. Clay, solemnized with 'tears in their eyes,' were not without the most decisive and fatal results. Mr. Clay himself, makes these "precious confessions." 1st. That he had ascertained Mr Adams's opinions respecting the Pennsylvania policy, the tariff. "I know his opinions." 2d. That the Pennsylvania policy, the tariff, would be safer in Mr. Adams's hands, than in Gen. Jackson's. 3d. That he did not certainly know "the opinions of his great rival," positively implying, that he did certainly know Mr. Adams's opinions 4th That Mr. Clay had not been disappointed. 5th. That this knowledge formed a motive with Mr. Clay, for voting for Mr. Adams. Now, let it be asked, in what way could Mr. Clay have come to this certain knowledge of Mr. Adams's determination to support the tariff? It could have been done only in two ways. First, from Mr. Adams himself, either verbally, by personal interview, or by written assurances. Second, from Mr. Adams's weeping negotiators and supplicators. Let it also be asked, at what time was this certain knowledge obtained from Mr. Adams? It was obtained time enough to form an inducement with Mr. Clay, "to make the selection he did." Now pray, reader, take these results, as proved by Mr. Clay himself, and recollecting the natural and obvious course of cause and effect—then ask, if they are not the necessary results from the adoption of Mr. Adams's overtures by Mr. Clay. The existence of these overtures, were made as early as the 8th of January, 1825. One result was, the ascertainment of Mr. Adams's determination to support the tariff. The knowledge of this fact was obtained, in time to form a motive with Mr. Clay, in voting for Mr. Adams; and he actually did vote for Mr. Adams, under the influence of that motive. From all this proof by Mr Clay himself, can there exist a doubt, but that so much of the bargain had been made, as to pledge Mr. Clay to place Mr. Adams in the Presidential chair, provided Mr. Adams would place Mr. Clay in the chair of the Secretary of State. The pledge of Mr. Adams to support the Pennsylvania policy, the tariff, must necessarily have been the consequence of previous understanding of the other points, and it is fair to conclude, was much more difficult to obtain, than the pledge to make Mr. Clay, Secretary of State. Mr. Adams' own office depending upon that pledge, whilst it is well known, that Mr. Adams is secretly and at heart opposed to the tariff, and the whole abominable doctrines upon which it is founded; whilst Mr. Adams has never, up to this day, lisped a sentence in approbation of that measure. It is known that he had expressed the strongest opinions in hostility to it, in 1823. Mr. Adams in his instructions to our Minister at Colombia, Mr. Anderson, lays down the following just and liberal principles for his guides, in forming a commercial treaty with Colombia.

"The arrival of Mr. Salazar may be expected from day to day. In the mean time, we are yet unacquainted with the particular objects of commercial intercourse which the Colombian Government wishes to regulate with us by Treaty. The *only object which we shall have much at heart in the negotiation will be the sanction by solemn compact of the broad and liberal principles of independence, equal favors, and reciprocity.* With this view I recommend to your particular attention the preamble, and first four articles of the first Treaty of amity and commerce between the United States and France, concluded on the 6th of February, 1778. The preamble is believed to be the first instance on the Diplomatic Record of Nations, upon which the true principles of all fair commercial negotiation between Independent States were laid down and proclaimed to the world. *That preamble was to the foundation of our commercial intercourse with the rest of mankind, what the Declaration of Independence was to that of our internal Government.*—

The two instruments were parts of one and the same system, matured by long and anxious deliberation of the founders of this Union in the ever memorable Congress of 1776; and as the Declaration of Independence was the fountain of all our municiple institutions; the preamble to the Treaty with France laid the corner stone for all our subsequent transactions of intercourse with foreign nations. Its principles should be therefore deeply impressed upon the mind of every statesman and negotiator of this Union, and the first four articles of the Treaty with France, contain the practical exposition of those principles which may serve as models for insertion in the projected Treaty, or in any other that we may hereafter negotiate with any of the rising Republics of the South.

There is indeed a principle of still more expansive liberality, which may be assumed as the basis of commercial intercourse between nation and nation. *It is that of placing the foreigner, in regard to all objects of navigation and commerce, upon a footing of equal favor with the native citizen, and to that end, of abolishing all discriminating duties and charges whatsoever. This principle is altogether congenial to the spirit of our institutions, and the main obstacle to its adoption consists in this: that the fairness of its operation depends upon its being admitted universally* — For, while two maritime and commercial nations should bind themselves to it as a compact operative only between *them*, a third Power, might avail itself of its own restrictive and discriminating regulations, to secure advantages to its own People, at the expence of both the parties to the Treaty. *The United States have nevertheless made considerable advances in their proposals to other nations towards the general establishment of this most liberal of all principals of commercial intercourse.*

Again, in the same instructions:

"Let her look to commerce and navigation, and not to empire, as her means of communication with the rest of the human family. These are the principles upon which our confederated republic is founded, and they are those upon which we hope our sisters of the southern continent will ultimately perceive it to be for their own welfare, no less than for that of the world, that they should found themselves."

What was Mr. Adams, and what his professions in 1823? He then professed to be a republican of the old school. The devoted advocate of the then true American system. Freedom to the citizen—freedom to commerce—written restraints on governments. What did Mr. Adams become in 1825, and what were then his professions? The devoted advocate of governments of unlimited will—of the monopolies and striction of despotism in every form and effect. This pledge was obtained by Mr. Clay from Mr. Adams, when Mr. Adams stood reproached before the world by Mr. Clay, "as an unprincipled political associate;" and Mr. Clay stood reproached before the world by Mr. Adams, as "an unprincipled hollow-hearted demagogue." Yet Mr. Adams yielded up his objections to the tariff, as well as Mr. Clay, for the glitter of the Presidential chair —and Mr. Clay yielded up his hostility to Mr. Adams, for the splendor of the Secretary of State, being a "safe precedent." Do not these overtures, and these results, proved by Mr. Clay himself, undeniably demonstrate the reality of the bargain: or, if there should be a remaining doubt, will not the known and established facts, dissipate every vestage of a doubt? That Mr. Adams was in fact placed in the Presidential chair by Mr. Clay; and Mr. Clay placed in the chair of Secretary of State by Mr. Adams. The two avowed objects of all the previous overtures and negotiations, and the natural and obvious effects directly resulting therefrom. Surely nothing can be wanting to prove the reality of the bargain to a certainty, yes, to every possible certainty,

'Leaving not *one* loop to hang *one* doubt upon.'

So far as relates to the pledge of the writer, to demonstrate from Mr. Clay's own evidence, the reality of the bargain, he thinks, he might safely stop here, with the most perfect confidence having redeemed his pledge; but there are other expositions, in Mr. Clay's books, which display so much corruption of mind, and profligacy of character, in this presumptuous lofty aspirant, that they ought to be exhibited, in full relief, to the view of the American people; who, from strange fortuitous circumstances, have become deeply interested in Mr. Clay's political destinies. Mr. Clay has peremptorily denied, that "Mr Adams ever made offers to to him," or that any overtures, of any sort or kind, respecting his vote for President, ever were made to him by others, in any way or form whatever; challenges the world for the proof, and boldly demands "the witness." The writer promptly accepts the challenge, and confidently presents the witness in the person of Henry Clay. Hear Henry Clay, in his own words: both in regard to his daring defiance, and the facts respecting the overtures:

Extract from Mr. Clay's second book, December, 1827.

"Thus, it appears, that in March, 1825, at various places, in the presence of many persons, Gen. Jackson took upon himself to represent, that Mr Adams had made offers to me, and that, if he had made similar proposals, he, and not Mr. Adams, would have been elected President. With what truth then, can he assert as he has done, that the "origin" of his charge was two years afterwards at his own fire-side? or that "he has not gone into the high-ways and market-places to proclaim his opinions?"

Extract from his electioneering speech, at Noble's, July, 1827.

"We stand confronted before the American people, pronouncing the charges, as I again do, destitute of all foundation, and gross aspersions, whether clandestinely, or openly issued, from the halls of the Capitol, the saloons of the Hermitage, or by press, by pen, or by tongue, and safely resting on my conscious integrity—I demand the witness, and await the event with fearless confidence—the issue is fairly joined—the imputed offence does not comprehend a single friend, but the collective body of my friends in Congress; and it accuses them of offering, and not with sanctioning corrupt propositions, derogating from honor, and in violation of the most sacred of duties."

Again, from the same speech:

"Mr. Adams and I myself are both guilty, or we are both innocent of the imputed arrangement between us—his innocence is absolutely irreconcilable with my guilt—readily admitted to be a self-evident postulation."

Mr. Clay takes care to place himself under the old adage "company is good, even to the gallows." Should that elevation be awarded to Mr. Clay, or should he be condemned to a less elevated doom, for "sanctioning corrupt propositions; derogatory from honor, and in violation of the most sacred of duties," he seems determined to be attended with a brilliant train of good company. Mr. Adams leading the van, and all his devoted friends in Congress, bringing up the rear—a band of formidable supporters, relied upon by Mr. Clay, as participators in his own sees, and thus lessening the odium, by its division. But the most profligate disclosure in the foregoing quotation, is founded in the most minute, and peremptory denial by Mr. Clay, that any overtures of any kind or sort whatever, either from Mr. Adams, or any other person, in any way or form whatever, were ever made to him, and demanding the witness to that charge. Now, hear Mr. Clay, substantially in his own words, in his letter to Mr. Blair:

"The language of Mr. Adams' friends, you give in nearly the following words:

'A friend of Mr. Adams comes to me 'with tears in his eyes' and says—Sir, Mr. Adams has always had the greatest respect for you and the highest admiration for your talents. There is no station to which you are not equal. You were undoubtedly the second choice of New-England, and I pray you to consider whether the public good and your own future interests do not distinctly point you to the course which you ought to pursue.'

You then give some reasons why Mr. Adams should be preferred to Gen. Jackson, among which I remember only the statement that the Ohio delegation had determined to vote for Mr. Adams, the alleged want of qualification in the General and his military propensities You then declare distinctly, and in nearly the following words:

'My friends entertain the belief that their kind wishes towards me, will, in the end, be more likely to be accomplished, by so bestowing their votes.'

You then declare, that you have urged them to be governed by their views of the public good alone, and aver that you have been influenced only by that consideration. In conclusion, you use nearly the following words:

'Your Representative is inclined to concur with us in these sentiments, and as I know his respect for your opinion, I request, if you concur in our views, that you will write to him by return mail to strengthen him in his inclinations. Know this to Crittenden alone.'"

Comment is unnecessary here. Mr. Clay here states himself in the most unequivocal terms, that a friend of Mr. Adams, not only made overtures, solemnized by tears in his eyes, but he states the overtures themselves, in general terms. He does more. He urges his friends to co-operate with him, to enable him to comply with the condition of the overtures on his part, particularly to fix the vote of a wavering member in favor of Mr. Adams. He does still more. He declares, in his Pittsburg speech, that he had ascertained to a certainty, that Mr. Adams, if elected, would support the Pennsylvania policy. Hear him again, in his own words:

"I have differed only once with Pennsylvania, and that was a difference in relation to mere not measures. It was not among the most inconsiderable reasons which induced me on that occasion to make the selection, which I did, that I thought the measures which Pennsylvania approved would be safer under the administration of our present Chief Magistrate—I knew his opinions, and I have not been disappointed—I did not certainly know the opinions of his great rival—I had my fears and succeeding events have not been of a nature to quiet them."

This is an obvious and natural consequence from the overtures described. He does still more. He accepts the corrupt proposition; and it is most unfortunate for the people and government of the United States, actually carried into practical effect. Was there ever a more daring and unblushing defiance? Was there ever one, more completely detected and exposed? And that too, by the evidence of the profligate challenger himself. But a still more reprehensible conduct, if possible on the part of Mr Clay, consists in the insidious attempts he has made, under the pretext of defending himself, to assail the reputation of General Jackson, with the most disingenuous vindictive malignity—and this attack made upon the point of overtures, in which, Mr. Clay himself is most vulnerable, and culpable—and Gen. Jackson most conspicuously honorable. Hear Mr. Clay. Extract from his speech at Nolles'.

"When the alledged overture was made, the election remained undecided. Why did not Gen. Jackson then, hold up to universal scorn, and indignation, the infamous bearer of the proposal, and those who dared to insult his honor and tamper with his integrity? If he had at that time denounced all the infamous parties concerned, demanded an inquiry in the House of Representatives, and established by satisfactory proof the truth of his accusation, there might and probably would have been a different result to the election.

Again, from the same speech.

"If he had rendered the distinguished member of Congress, a little more distinguished, by instantly ordering him from his presence, and by forthwith denouncing him, and the infamous proposition, which he bore to the American public, we should be little better prepared to admit the claims to unfurnished integrity, which the General so modestly puts forward. But according to his own account, a corrupt and scandulous proposal is made to him, the person who conveyed it, advises him to accept it, and yet that person still retains the friendship of Gen. Jackson, who is so tender of his character, that his name is carefully concealed and reserved to be hereafter brought forward as a witness A man who if he be a member of the House of Representatives, is doubly infamous—infamous for the advice which he gave, and infamous for his willingness to connive at the corruption of the body, of which he was a sworn member, is the credible witness, by whom, Gen. Jackson stands ready to establish the corruption of men, whose characters were never questioned."

At the time these cold disengenuous charges were issued against Gen. Jackson, the substance of Mr Clay's letter to Mr. Blair, was not known to the public; since it's publication,

Mr. Clay, by his own 'precious confessions,' is placed precisely in the situation, in which he falsely attempts to place Gen. Jackson. It now turns out; that he not only received overtures, but received them under a peculiar solemnization—bathed with tears—why did not Mr. Clay preserve the noble, honorable conduct, which he urges upon Gen. Jackson—why did he not hold up this whining, weeping adamite to "public scorn, and indignation"" Why not do it now? And who is that whining supplicator in favor of Mr. Adams? Since the publication of the substance of Mr. Clay's letter to Mr. Blair, ought not the public to demand the name of this whining, weeping intriguer? Ought he to remain concealed, and hold his station in society? Ought not every friend of Mr. Adams' coming within the implication to demand the name of the culprit, to exempt himself from the suspicion, hovering over all? Surely this weeping supplicator ought not to be longer concealed? Is it true that there was one? Is it true, that there were many? In either case, according to Mr. Clay's own denunciation against Gen. Jackson, the one, or the many ought to be instantly unmasked, and to stand before the public in all their horrible deformities. Suppose it not to be true in relation to one, or to many. Where is Mr. Clay's boasted honor and veracity? Gone! Gone forever! But instead of this honorable course, what course did Mr. Clay actually pursue? He accepted the overture with complacency, and directed it to its iniquitous ends. He actually succeeded, by unwearied exertion, and intrigues to carry it into practical effect. Adams was made President by Clay. And Clay Clay made Secretary by Adams. What was Gen. Jackson's conduct, when from the commencement of a communication from Mr. Buchanan, he thought leading to a overture? He honorably strangled it in its cradle. Upon this first blush of an overture, or even a conversation leading to it, Gen. Jackson in a frank and honorable manner, crushed it in the bud. But what was the nature of Mr. Buchanan's communication? It was merely to inform Gen. Jackson of the intrigues then carrying on by Mr. Adams and his friends, and to consult him upon the means of counteraction. These intrigues of Mr. Adams and his friends, are now undeniably proved by the evidence of Mr. Clay himself.

The writer's heart has become sick of the disclosure of so much human vice and human depravity. He will terminate the disgusting catalogue, with only one more exposure of perfidy and duplicity from Mr. Clay towards Mr. Adams. Mr. Clay peremptorily denies the charges of embittered hostility existing at the time, between himself and Mr. Adams. He also denies all responsibility for pamphlets and newspaper essays published by his friends in Kentucky against Mr. Adams; or that he ever did any thing against him, "inconsistent with a fair and honorable competition." Mr. Clay also labors to meliorate the embittered feelings of hostility existing between himself and Mr. Adams, by reducing it to something like an innocent difference of opinion, both in relation to *fact* and *principle*; but all this difference with the best intentions on both sides. Hear his own inventive evasive in his own words.

Extract from Mr. Clay's own reference to the National Intelligencer, 1st of March, 1816.

"When the British Commissioners demanded, in their projet, a renewal to Great Britain of the right to the navigation of the Mississippi, secured by the treaty of 1783, a bare majority of the American Commissioners offered to renew it, upon the condition that the liberties in question were renewed to us. He was not one of that majority. He would not trouble the Committee with his reasons for being opposed to the offer. A majority of his colleagues, *actuated he believed by the best motives*, made, however, the offer, and it was refused by the British Commissioners."

Now hear him in an extract from his address to his constituents:

"The relations in which I stood to Mr. Adams constitute the next theme of the address, which I shall notice. I am described as having assumed "a position of peculiar and decided hostility to the election of Mr. Adams," and expressions towards him are attributed to me, which I never used. *I am made also responsible "for pamphlets and essays of great ability," published by my friends in Kentucky, in the course of the canvass.* The injustice of the principle of holding me thus answerable, may be tested by applying it to the case of Gen. Jackson, in reference to publications issued, for example, from the Columbian Observer. That I was not in favor of the election of Mr. Adams, when the contest was before the people, is most certain. Neither was I in favor of that of Mr. Crawford or Gen. Jackson. *That I ever did any thing against Mr. Adams, or either of the other gentlemen, inconsistent with a fair and honorable competition, I utterly deny.* My relations to Mr. Adams have been the subject of much misconception, if not misrepresentation. I have been stated to be under a public pledge to expose some nefarious conduct of that gentleman, during the negotiation at Ghent; which would prove him to be entirely unworthy of public confidence; and that, with a knowledge of his perfidy, I nevertheless, voted for him. If these imputations are well founded, I should indeed, be a fit object for public censure; but if, on the contrary, it shall be found that others, inimical both to him and to me, have substituted their own interested wishes for my public promises, I trust that the indignation which they would excite, will be turned from me. My letter addressed to the Editors of the Intelligencer, under date of the 15th November, 1822, is made the occasion for ascribing to me the promise and the pledge to make those treasonable disclosures on Mr. Adams. Let that letter speak for itself, and it will be seen how little justification there is for such an assertion. It adverts to the controversy which had arisen between Messrs. Adams and Russell, and then proceeds to state that, "in the course of several publications, of which it has been the occasion, and particularly, in the appendix to a pamphlet which had been recently published by the Hon. John Q. Adams, I think there are some errors, (no doubt unintentional,) both as to matters of fact, and matters of opinion, in regard to the transactions at Ghent, relating to the navigation of the Mississippi, and certain liberties claimed by the United States in fisheries, *and to the part I bore in those transactions.*"

Since these inventive, deceptive expositions, it has been positively proved, that Mr. Clay not only verbally represented Mr. Adams in the correct terms, but furnished the materials for these same newspaper essays, urged the republication of some of them in a pamphlet form; approved their contents when published, contributed to their circulation, and actually contributed $100 to defray the expenses of their publication. That the pamphlet and newspaper essays, contained the most unprincipled, opprobrious and degrading charges against Mr. Adams—and under epithets, the most coarse and offensive, which the English language afforded, accusing Mr. Adams of every species of public vice and private immorality—while these hostile, vindictive proceedings were clandestinely carrying on under the invisible influence of Mr. Clay, he was holding out a very different language to the public, and to Mr. Adams, as he now publicly avosw, reducing this active, inveterate hostility, to a mere matter of difference of opinion, as to matter of FACT and *principle;* and in this state of things, Mr. Clay solemnly pledges himself to his constituents, and to the world, that he never did any thing against Mr. Adams, inconsistent with fair and honorable competition. What notions must Mr. Clay indulge as to the character of fair and honorable means to effect a favorite end? A perfect Machivael in principle, all means are lawful, provided the end be good; all means are fair and honorable for the good of placing Mr. Clay in the Presidential chair; and when that failed, the like means may be employed to make him Secretary of State—with the advantage of a safe precedent. How profligate!! How deplorable!! But perhaps it may be objected, that resorting to this evidence of others, respecting this point, is a departure from the promise of the writer, to resort for his proofs to Mr. Clay's evidence alone. Perhaps it may be asked, where is the evidence of Mr. Clay's own admission of these facts? So far as his furnishing materials for the newspaper essays and pamphlets, and contributing to their circulation, will be seen in his letters to Mr. Kendall; and so far as relates to the proof of his contributing $100 for defraying the expenses of their publication, the proof, although from another, is of character to throw the burthen of a denial on Mr. Clay. The $100 are proved to have been paid by order, on Mr. Clay's friends, or agents; so that, if the charge be not true, Mr. Clay is in possession of the means of exposing the falsehood. This he has not attempted; nor has he denied the truth of the statement! This refusal to deny, is an admission of the truth of the charge, by Mr. Clay himself, and makes the evidence Mr. Clay's own evidence, under the rule of law and common sense, to which reference has heretofore been made. Now, reader, you have a full review before you of a *part* of the evidence, in relation to the imputed corrupt bargain between Messrs. Adams and Clay, under its new aspects and coloring, furnished by Mr. Clay himself, either in his own words, or sanctioned by his admissions—and does it not fully and completely prove the reality of the bargain, leaving not *one loop* to hang one doubt upon? Does it not prove much more? That any species of perfidy, duplicity, contradiction, hypocrisy and intrigue, have been employed, first to effect it; and then to conceal it. If so, what a scene of lamentable reflections is here opened to view? It has heretofore been admitted by all parties, that if the charge of the corrupt bargain be found to be true, the infamy of the transaction ought doubtlessly to exclude the parties to it, from their present high stations, and from all confidence in future, and it is believed, that no one has stamped the transaction, if true, more indelibly with the seal of infamy, than Mr. Clay himself. Now if, contrary to all former admissions, these two Machievals, were to be re-elected to their present high stations; what would be its most obvious effects upon the people, and government of the United States? Would it not go to sanction their political heresies, and corrupt practices, with the approbation of the people? What have already been the effects of these heresies, and corrupt practices? They have already corrupted the public morals, and destroyed the written constitution of the United States. If the measures producing these deprecated effects, be sanctioned by the public approbation, can there be the shadow of a hope of the restoration of the public morals, and the renovation, and reinvigoration of the written constitution? Under the best auspicies, from the administration of others, there can hardly be a hope indulged of efficiently producing these blessed results, but the re-election of the Machievals, would fix, for *centuries*, the seal of destruction upon the public morals, and the written constitution; and the last vestage of hope for the rights and liberties of the whole human race, would be swept away forever with their names!!!

From the Ithaca Journal, Aug. 27.

MR. ADAMS AND MASONRY.

In the Journal of July 30th, we took occasion to notice the efforts making by some of the supporters of Mr. Adams in this quarter, to pervert the anti-masonic excitement to his advantage. We then stated the fact, that most of the members of his cabinet, as well as many of his present supporters in this state and county, were masons; and our conviction that Mr. Adams was also himself a mason—hence arguing the *inconsistency* and the *perfidy* of urging on this unhappy excitement to promote the election of Mr. Adams. As one proof that Mr. Adams was a member of the fraternity, we stated that Major Russell, editor of the Boston Centinel, had declared, that *he saw Mr. Adams made a mason*, some years ago, in a lodge in that city. It seems that a partizan of Mr. Adams in this village, has communicated our article to Major Russell, with whom we do not exchange, and thus procured us the favour of a letter from him on the subject. This letter, which Major R. requests us to publish, would have been entitled to our respectful as well as prompt attention, except for a circumstance not much, we conceive, to the credit of the writer. At the same time that he was addressing us with protestations of a peculiar nature, and enforcing them by the most delicate appeals, he furnishes a *copy* of this letter to David Woodcock, *a member of the anti-masonic corresponding committee* of this county, and places it at his *entire disposal!* Thus he pays us the sorry compliment of *doubting* our sense of honour and justice, or betrays a conscious

less that we should place little faith in the truth and sincerity of *his* protestations. We know not in what school Major Russell has acquired his notions of honour: Perhaps they have been acquired in the school of *John Quincy Adams*, who is a professor of *et quette* as well as of *rhetorick*: according to our views of propriety, the conduct of Major Russell in this instance, was neither that of an honourable minded man nor a gentleman. We must therefore r ceive and treat his letter, as it was doubtless designed, in the character of a political document, produced and written "to effect a political purpose." For this purpose it has already been used, and before the origioal letter came into our possession. In the Chronicle of last week, Mr Woodcock procures the publication of Major Russell's letter to him: and a threat is given to publish the letter to us, of which Mr. W. has a copy, unless we shall have published it in our paper of Wednesday last. Now Mr. Woodcock and Mr Spencer must have known, that the editor of the Journal was then absent, and that he could not at that time have received the letter to which they alluded. They therefore took advantage of his absence, to misrepresent the actual import of the letter, and to prejudge and forestall the public impression upon the subject. Of this mean and contemptible artifice, however, we make no complaint: it is no more than we should expect from such a quarter. The letter to Mr. Woodcock, and the remarks of the editor of the Chronicle, convey the impression that Major Russell *denies* having declared that *he saw Mr. Adams made a mason;* and Mr. Spencer observes, that the letter to us "places the editor of this paper, and those who have made the assertion on the authority of Mr. Russell, in no very enviable light." Now Mr. Russell *expressly admits* having made the declaration; but he says, he has *since* become convinced he was *mistaken as to the person!!* The *previous* explanation, which he speaks of, and which we suppose was similar to the present, we never saw; nor has it been re-published, to our knowledge, in any newspaper whatever. Indeed, the Major's "explanation," which he was so much "disappointed in *not seeing*" in our paper, was published by his own account, *before* the letter it professes to *explain*, was *written*, viz. on the *29th of March*, whereas the Boston letter which we copied, was dated the eighth of *April*, and published in the Ontario Messenger of *April 30th!!!* The letter from Major Russell we now publish, together with one from full as respectable a source, received at the same time, in answer to one from us, referring expressly to our article of the 30th July, and making inquiry upon the subject which it embraced.

Boston, 7th August, 1828.

Col. Ebenezer Mack,

Sir—I have now before me your paper of the 30th July, ult. and have noticed therein the republication of an article from the Ontario Messenger, purporting to be an extract of a letter from Boston, of April 30, in which my name is used as having stated that I had seen John Quincy Adams made a mason many years ago; but I was disappointed in *not seeing* in your paper the explanation which I made to the Centinel of the 29th March, of the occurrence, in place of your assertion that I had never denied the statement as first published. In that explanation your readers would have found, that I expressly acknowledged that I had mistaken the initiation of another person for that of *John Quincy Adams* and that I was satisfied, from due inquiry and information, that *Mr. Adams had never been made a Mason.*

Although reluctant ever to introduce masonic subjects into political controversy, the omission of my explanation compels me to request of your justice and fraternal feelings, to insert this letter in your journal, so that no further use may be made of a sheer mistake, to effect a political purpose; and which mistake arose from a long lapse of time, and was promptly explained.

The letter published in the *Messenger* being erroneous in its statements, the following are given on masonic honor:

Some time last spring Mr. John Roberts, known by me to be a mason, called on me to inquire if I had any knowledge of Mr. Adams being a free-mason; and I expressed my belief that he had been made in St. John's or Massachusetts Lodge many years since, and that I was present at his initiation as a visiter; but at the same time distrusting my recollection and supposing Mr. R. to have made the inquiry to obtain information as a mason, I referred him to the journals of the lodges, in which, if Mr. A. had been initiated, a record would be found. I was afterwrads informed by Mr. R. that he had examined the records, and had not found any mention made in them of Mr. Adams. He did not state to me that there was any deficiency in the records, asserted in the Messenger letter. Having immediately made due inquiry, I found that Mr. Adams had never been made a mason, and was satisfied that the initiation I had seen was that of Josiah Quincy, and that I had mistaken *him* for John Quincy Adams. At that remote time I had no personal acquaintance with either of the above now distinguished gentlemen.

To this "plain unvarnished tale," I deem it but justice to add, that when Mr. Roberts found that the information he had received from me had become the subject of political remark in the newspapers, he expressed his regret at the publication, denied having any agency in it, and attributed it to a person, not a mason, to whom he had casually mentioned the subject. I have no doubt that the letter of which you have published the extract, was written by some eves-dropper to effect a party end.

With the repetition of my request, that you will give publicity to this note—with the renewal my of conviction and my regret, that John Q. Adams never has been made a mason.

I am, with consideration,

Your brother and humble serv't,

BENJ. RUSSELL.

From the Ithaca Journal.

ADAMS AND MASONRY—ONCE MORE.

The followimg interesting letter, received yesterday, it becomes our duty to publish; and we present it to our readers without remark.

Boston, September 15, 1828.

Col. E. MACK,

Sir—I noticed in your paper under date of August, the 27th ult. a letter addressed to you, dated at Boston, August 7th, signed by Benjamin Russell; in which he takes the liberty of using my name, probably more to impugn a

particular object, that, to give a correct statement of facts. I will now give you a simple statement of the conversation, as it occurred between Major Russell and myself. Some time in March last, I called on Major Russell and asked him if John Q. Adams was a Mason. He answered me promptly and unequivocally in the affirmative, and proceeded to say, he was present when Mr. Adams took his first degree; that the circumstance was fresh in his memory, and that he was initiated in St. John's lodge. I then asked him the time the ceremony took place. He replied, he could not then recollect the year, but it was about the time he [Adams] left college; and further observed, that I could ascertain the time by searching the records of the lodge. The records of the lodge were accordingly had access to; but strange as it may appear, the records from 1784, to 1792, were not to be found; and as Mr. Adams became of age in 1788, his name must of course have been on the records that are missing, or suppressed.

Subsequent to the records being searched, I again saw the Major, and told him Mr. Adams' name could not be found in the lodge. He again replied, that he "could not be mistaken," as he perfectly recollected the place the lodge was held in. And to corroborate the fact named, that the late Governor Gore was present as a visiter. Mr. Russell states in his letter to you that he mistook Mr. Adams for Josiah Quincy; but that must be an error; for we find that when Mr. Quincy was made a mason Mr. Russell was not present, if the records of the lodge be correct. Mr. Russell further states, in his letter to you, that he was not personally acquainted with either Adams or Quincy, at that remote time. I regret the gentleman's memory is so treacherous; for we find in the year 1791, John Q. Adams published a series of numbers, under the signature of "Publicus," in which he made a most powerful attempt to annihilate Republicanism, in the Columbian Centinel of which Mr. Russell was the Editor. The Major further states to you, that when I found the [illegible] no be indigested me had I become the [illegible] of political remark in the newspapers, that I regretted the publication denied having any agency in it, and that I attributed it to a person not a mason. But here the Major clearly remembers what never was said, or intimated by me, or even alluded to, as I never have regretted the inquiry or publication of the fact; but do regret that the Major should be so unfortunate as to make statements so erroneous; and further regret, that any person who has been honoured with the sublime degrees of masonry, and knows the blessings of the masonick institution to mankind from the days of king Solomon to the present time, should lend himself to give currency to such base and unwarrantable reports as are every day going the rounds in our publick prints. A sense of duty compels me to make these remarks, that the public may not be deceived by art, design, equivocation, or imposition. I am, Sir, respectfully yours,

JOHN BORRIES.

A machine has been invented by a Mr. Hobart, of Montgomery County, New York, by which a ton in weight of Liverpool salt may be made in a single day.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

This number completes the series promised in our original prospectus. We have, however, to type, and will publish forty additional pages, containing matter of high interest, which with that in the preceeding numbers, will make the Extra Telegraph a valuable book for future reference. With this view it is intended to issue an additional number to contain the official returns and a table of contents. That must necessarily be delayed until after the Presidential election is closed.

Having devoted our time for nearly three years, exclusively to the cause of our country, the bitterness of the persecution we have endured, and the proscription and denunciation we have made against, will form, it is hoped, some apology for speaking of ourselves.

The flattering testimonials of public confidence in our possession, emboldens us to say, that our private interest is not nearly connected with the public welfare. Is a free press one of the strongest guardians of public liberty? Is it not the private interest of the conductor of such a press so to discharge his duty, as to retain the public confidence? It is an amiable trait in the character of the American people, that whilst they are jealous of, and always ready to resist encroachments upon the fundamental principles of our institutions, they are prone to give a confiding support to those public functionaries, who, if faithful, can do most to undermine the foundation of civil liberty. To such a people a free press is the natural and surest guardian. A well regulated love of praise, and a well founded hope of reward, are the strongest inducements to good and virtuous actions. The certainty of detection and the dread of punishment are the strongest preservatives of the public morals. When we thus speak, we do it with no spirit of vain boasting. When after much reflection, we ventured to place ourselves in a position which, under the exigencies of the times, necessarily fixed upon us the eyes, and in some degree the hopes of the Republican party, we might feel the want of those abilities, the education and experience which the position and the times demanded. Our candid use was in the [illegible] gity of our own motives, the intelligence, the virtue, and may we be permitted to say, the gratitude of the people.

The strong excitement which has pervaded the community will be succeeded by an apathy. The public mind, fatigued by the excesses of the present canvass, will fall into torpor; *but the vigilant sentinel must not sleep.* The enemy is routed, not destroyed. The gates of the citadel must be guarded with redoubled vigilance lest spies, in the garb of deserters and neutrals, enter the fort and bind the strong man while he is asleep.

So far as relates to a subscription, we have not been disappointed. In a short space of our editorial career, more than twenty thousand names have been placed on our list. To retain such a patronage from the people themselves as will place us beyond the contrivance of the hand necessary that has driven our cotemporaries to depend upon executive favor, is our great desideratum.

To do this we must make the Telegraph such a paper as it is the interest of the public to patronize. It must give a faithful and full report of the proceedings of both houses of Congress. It must give the earliest news and foreign news, and must heartily assist with the literature and science as well as the politics of the country. We have provided able reporters, and will lay no pains and little time unemployed in this, if we can afford to do so.

Some of our subscribers have complained that the Extra Telegraph has not reached them in time. So far as it depended upon us, every effort has been made; but the edition has been so large, that although we have driven the presses day and night, it is as much as we could do, to make up for a few days suspension, occasioned by an accidental deficiency in our supply of paper. To enable us to obviate this objection, we have contracted for, and expect to have in operation about the commencement of the next session of congress, a press capable of executing at least fifty thousand impressions per diem. With such a press under the arrangement we have made, we can promise the earliest intelligence, foreign or domestic, to such of our readers as from their local position look to this paper for it.

We propose, so soon as our new press is in operation, to increase the size of our paper to that of the largest in the country. To deliver the daily as heretofore, at ten dollars per annum. The triweekly at six, and the weekly at four. The weekly paper will be published in the same form as the extra, but of a size to contain at least twice the matter, and on a paper of the best quality. A sample sheet of which will, in a few weeks, be published and sent to most of our subscribers.

To obviate the loss and uncertainty of collections, we propose to furnish the paper to agents, who obtain subscribers, and become themselves responsible for the payment, quarterly in advance, at the following rates:

Daily, seven dollars per annum.
Triweekly, four dollars per annum.
Weekly, two dollars.

No deduction will be made to less than five subscribers, and each agent will be expected to give bond with approved security for the faithful payment of his dues.

These remarks are submitted under the hope that those to whom we are already under many obligations, will find it not incident to make the Telegraph the pride of its friends, and the [illegible] of the [illegible]

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly, until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*, subject to newspaper postage and *no more*.

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 23, 1828. No. 33.

IMPORTANT DISCLOSURE.

The light which the following communication from Mr. Jonathan Russell, sheds upon a subject, heretofore of much interest, although but imperfectly understood, because of the mystery in which it was enveloped, has induced us to extend the issue of our extra paper beyond the number originally proposed. We lay it before our readers as part of the secret history of our country, deeply interesting to posterity. Whether Mr. Clay will now redeem his pledge, and give the history of the open day and secret night transaction, will, no doubt, depend upon the effect which, in his opinion, such a procedure will have upon the public mind. After the picture which Mr. Russell has drawn of Mr. Adams, for the correctness of which Mr. Clay himself is a witness, it is to be expected that they will both break the seal of silence, which, but for this disclosure, would no doubt have been perpetual.

We have introduced the letter of Mr. Clay to Mr. Russell, and the reply of Mr. Russel to Mr. Clay, into the body of his letter to the Chairman of the committee, because as Mr. Clay acknowledges the receipt of that letter, and is, in its face, called as a witness to its truth; it shows the opinion which Mr. Clay, himself, entertained of Mr. Adams, until he found it for his interest to supplant the colleague alluded to, and become, what his Editor of the Richmond Whig has called, the "The power behind the throne greater than the throne itself."

Mr. Russell complains that the Central Committee have adopted Mr. Adams' book as the text, from which they drew the inference that he acted in concert with Mr. Clay. It is not for us to enter upon the defence of the committee now. They were examining the relation which Mr. Clay had borne to Mr. Adams. The latter had pointed to Mr. Clay, as an accomplice with Mr. Russell; and, if the committee have entertained an erroneous opinion of the relation which Mr. Russell and Mr. Clay bore to each other, it is to be attributed to the want of that information which Mr. Russell had it in his power to give, but which was withheld until the discussions, in which the committee participated, have exposed the hollow pretensions by which Mr. Clay has induced Mr. Russell to believe that he was a friend.

We proceed to lay Mr. Russell's letter before the public—that he will be assailed by all the virulence of the coalition is to be expected—that he must triumph in the high gratification of rendering an essential service to his country, in the double exposure of a false friend and an old enemy, is manifest.

MILTON, *September* 10, 1828.

To JOHN P. VAN NESS, Esq.

SIR: As the Chairman, and, of course, as the ostensible organ of "the Jackson Corresponding Committee, of the District of Columbia," I now claim the privilege of addressing you.

That committee, in their "reply," published in the United States' Telegraph *Extra*, of the 10th May last, to "Mr. Clay's last address," took the freedom of presenting me, entirely uncalled for by their professed, general object, on that occasion, "to the People of the U. States," and, as it appeared to me, in a style peculiarly ungracious towards me. This seemed, indeed, the more extraordinary, as I was not aware of having done aught to deserve ill, either of the present friends of General Jackson, or of the former friends of Mr. Crawford, in their successive or joint array for the presidential struggle. This rude and wanton notice of me, by the committee, was not only irreconcilable with the political faith which we all profess, and with the success of the great political object which we now pursue, but with all the notions which I have cherished of the amiable temper and unsinning courtesy of their chairman. I will still believe, that you could not, even for a moment, have, *advisedly*, impaired your just title to this character; but that all of which I may complain "in the reply," is to be ascribed to the less fastidious zeal of others. In acquitting you, however, of all *wilful* participation in the offence, I could not now gratify the real offenders by condescending to notice them, in this public manner, had I not been persuaded, by some of them, who desired

stand high in public estimation, that "it was not intended to disparage me, or to wound my feelings." Although I will frankly own, that they appear to me to have chosen rather an awkward or ambiguous way to exhibit their consideration and regard; yet circumstances, which have since occurred, or recently became known to me, have powerfully conspired, with this willing faith, to induce me to listen to the wishes of my friends.

In my observations on "the reply," I shall be as brief as perspicuity will permit. The extract from the joint despatch of the American Commissioners to their government, dated at Ghent, December 25th, 1814, I find to be entirely correct. The manner of accounting for the pression, "a majority of us," used in that extract, and for the authority for which your committee appeal to Mr. Adams' book upon the Mississippi and the fisheries," is *not correct*. It was on the suggestion of Mr. Clay, himself, that this expression was inserted—with his memory, on this point, mine perfectly accords. In his letter to me, of the 9th July, 1822, he says, "you will, no doubt, recollect that *I suggested when we went to sign that despatch*, the mention of the words "a majority," *and my purpose for doing it was not mistaken*." "How it" (that offer) "was carried, it was not necessary for them" (the British Commissioners) "to know, but might, to us, have been highly injurious. But it was material *that our* government, to which we were responsible, should know how we did act; and, accordingly, when we came to address it, we informed it that it was the affair of the majority, &c." "It was the less necessary for us to disclose the fatal secret of our divisions to the enemy, because, &c."

After you are apprized, by this letter of Mr. Clay, how strong our obligation was to acquaint our own government "how *we* did act," you will not believe that your committee *ought* to have expressed so much surprise at my solicitude to conform to it. In the discharge of this *duty* I did not, indeed, feel a right to speak for any other member of the mission, whether of the majority or the minority, but leaving each one perfectly free to speak for himself, and to render, as I intended to do, when and where he pleased, his own reasons for his own act. I cannot admit, unhesitatingly, the solidity of the reas[illegible] of your committee, "that it was *very singular*" that I should, without even desiring to suggest to our government the existence of any diversity of opinion, in relation to "the offer of the Mississippi navigation," have *so far changed my mind on the same day*, as to deem it necessary for me, in vindication of my motives, to give an explanation to my government for voting in the minority. Could it, indeed, have required *a singular change of mind*, to have been even indifferent, whether *the fact of there having been a minority*, were stated or not, *in the joint despatch of the Secretary of State*, and yet, when that fact had actually been so stated, to deem it proper, *on the same day*, in writing a letter to him, frankly to avow *how* I had voted, and to express my intention of communicating, when more at leisure, my reasons *why* I had so voted?

"Nobody," your committee say, "had denounced *my motives*, and the Secretary of State *would never have known it had I not announced it myself*." Pray what right had your committee thus to insinuate that *a consciousness of being in the wrong*, should have deterred me from declaring myself to have been one of the minority?" But I will press this inquiry no further, presuming that you could have meant nothing uncourteous.—Still, had I been willing to conceal, even from *our own government*, all knowledge of our divisions at Ghent, on this subject, and of the part I had taken, and had, too, been a thorough convert to the political morality of seeking impunity by the concealment of crime, could your committee have been quite sure that "I should never have been known as one of the minority?" Could they have foretold, with absolute certainty, that all curiosity would have slept a sleep of death? That no spirit of inquiry would be awake, and abroad to ransack "the open day and secret night," to discover things necessarily intrusted for safe keeping to so many bosoms, liable to be agitated by such various passions and feelings, and to be exposed to the influence of such a diversity of honest views, if not of vain and capricious notions? Giving to these considerations their due weight, and admitting the fitness, already urged, of accounting for all my official conduct, where alone I felt myself responsible, I might—notwithstanding it well became Mr. Adams to affect to sneer at my mention of "candor" in acknowledging myself one of the minority—have hoped that your committee would *not* have pronounced it *evident* that I must have had "a motive in this transaction, *distinct*

from self vindication? Was there, indeed, no candor in frankly avowing myself to be responsible for something which a majority of the mission appeared to have believed erroneous? and thus, as far as belonged to me, have saved them from all invidious suspicion which might have resulted to them from the indiscriminate language of the joint despatch, of the same date, in this particular? I owe it also to truth, here to declare, that I have no recollection nor belief of acquainting Mr. Clay, at that time, with any knowledge of my communication to the Secretary of State, of the fact, "of my having been one of the minority." "The mystery of ruin which"—on no better authority than the book of Mr. Adams—your committee venture to repeat "had been brewing between Mr. Clay and me against him, from the signature of the treaty of Ghent," could, therefore, have owed its existence alone to the distempered imagination, or blind malignity of Mr. Adams himself.

While your committee appear to be so ready to echo what Mr. Adams, in his book, says about me, and to call me to a severe account for writing my separate letter of the 25th of December, 1814, they ought, at least, to have inquired if the assertions of Mr. Adams, which they thus repeated, were true, and if his own conduct conformed to them. When they found in the very beginning of his book, (page 6,) his assertion that neither Mr. Clay *nor any other member of the mission, save Mr. Russell*, had thought it necessary, at that time, to inform the government how he had voted, on the question, or to vindicate his vote; they ought to have examined if the evidence furnished by the book itself, was in strict accordance with that assertion. They would have found (pages 54, 55,) that Mr. Adams and the other members of the majority had, in direct contradiction to that assertion, thought it necessary, at the very time, and in the very joint despatch, to inform government how they had voted, and to indicate their vote. Mr. Gallatin, one of that majority, thought it necessary, too, in a *separate* letter, of the same date, to indicate, with sufficient clearness, to the Secretary of State, how he had voted, and, again, to vindicate his vote, (page 57) nay, the committee would have found (page 206) that Mr. Adams had, himself, the very next day, (December 26, 1814,) written a separate letter on the subject, not direct to the government, indeed, but to his *father*, in which he not only signified, with much self-complacency, how he had voted, and not only numbered, but denounced the *minority*, by saying, "this offer met, however, *with great opposition among ourselves*, for there were two of us against making it, and who thought the navigation of the Mississippi *incomparably more valuable* than the *contested part* of the fisheries. Not so did the British government think; for they, instead of accepting it, offered us an article stipulating to negotiate hereafter for an *equivalent* to be given by Great Britain for the right of navigating the Mississippi; and by the United States for the liberties of the fisheries *within* British jurisdiction." Mr. Adams also says, "this was merely to obtain from us the formal admission that both rights were abrogated by the war." What sagacity!! Some of us, at least, had good reason to believe, that they preferred *their article* to *our offer*, because *our offer* would secure *a title to both rights*, while, under *their article*, they might have required an exorbitant *equivalent*—and expecting to capture and intending to hold New Orleans, they would, in fact, acquire the navigation of the Mississippi without any equivalent at all. One of the British ministers, after the signature of the treaty, declared to one or more of the American ministers, in private conversation, with an air of self-gratulation, that New Orleans was taken, and significantly observed, that the navigation of the Mississippi would not probably, *in future, cause so much difficulty between the two countries.*

This separate letter of Mr. Adams, to his father, with the secrets of the mission of Ghent, and the emphatic *denunciations* of the minority which it contained, was sent by the latter to James Lloyd, Esq. "one of the most distinguished merchants and statesmen of the Union." Mr. Lloyd, in compliance with the intimation which had been given him with the letter, addressed, on the 8th March, 1815, a long communication to the elder Mr. Adams, concerning *the fisheries*. He said, at the same time, "my information with regard to them, has, *in general*, been derived from *respectable* sources, on whom I can rely, never having any direct interest or concern in them myself." The letter from Mr. Lloyd was transmitted to Mr. John Quincy Adams, at London, in the summer of 1815; and, among the papers published in the book, as containing the *material* parts of the information which had been requested, it is placed in the *foremost rank*, (page 209.) Mr

Lloyd, grateful, no doubt, for the condescension and confidence with which he had thus been distinguished by the sire, had, full of the god, snatched from the Quincy altar the fuming censor, and rapturously and devoutly waving it around, filled all the temple with the "ancient and consecrated" fragrance of the incense with which the race is so richly perfumed. He begins his devotion by declaring "these fisheries were most advantageously secured to the United States by the treaty of 1783, and made, *as I have always understood*, a *sine qua non* of that treaty, PRINCIPALLY by one of our ministers." (page 210.) He calls this *contested* right of fishing within British jurisdiction, "a gem which should never be surrendered; *nor will it ever be* BY ANY STATESMAN ALIVE TO THE INTERESTS OF HIS COUNTRY. Compared, in its consequences, with a free right of navigating the Mississippi, it is even a more unequal stake than would be "six French rapiers imposed against six Barbary horses"!! (page 217.) In the next page, meaning, no doubt, *practically* to apply the *wisdom* of these remarks, he says, "She," (Great Britain,) "has, therefore, notwithstanding *the opinion* OF TWO OF THE AMERICAN COMMISSIONERS, and her own probable pretensions of fairness, given up nothing, in point of value, with the fisheries."

Your Committee, who appear to be much more familiar with Mr. Adams' book than I can pretend to be, could not well have been ignorant that Mr. Adams had himself not only denounced the *minority of two*, in a letter to his father, but the father had sent this letter to "one of the most distinguished merchants and statesmen of the Union," who virtually reproached the two Commissioners of the minority with having done an act which never could have been done "by any statesman alive to the interests of his country." He compiled, too, a long dissertation, most profound, no doubt, for the information of Mr. Adams, and in vindication of his vote as one of the majority! Mr. Lloyd, too, although he might not have been expressly told—but most probably he was—that I was one of the minority, must have inferred this fact from the arrogant expression of the letter which had been submitted to him by the father. Mr. Adams there says, "*as a citizen of Massachusetts, I felt it to be* MOST PECULIARLY *my duty* not to abandon any one of her rights, and I would have refused to sign the treaty, had any one of them been abandoned." Mr. Lloyd well knew, that, for *any peculiarity* as a citizen of Massachusetts, Mr. Adams could have had no plausible pretext, other than might have been suggested by my daring to differ from him on the relative value of the fishing liberties within the British jurisdiction, and the free navigation of the Mississippi within our own.

In addition to all I have here said on my liability of being known as one of the minority, and on the fitness of my assigning *my motives* to my government for being so; on the total falsehood of the assertion, that no member of the mission, excepting me, "had thought it necessary, at the time, to inform government how he had voted on the question, or to vindicate his vote; in addition, too, to the fair inference, that I was actually one of the minority, all which your Committee might have learned from the book with which they were so well acquainted—they might, also, have learned from that book, before their reply, that I had complained of being designated, in 1816, in the Boston Centinel, as having been, at Ghent, unfavorable to the fisheries. It is not necessary, I trust, to inquire, here, *who* could have given that information, to persuade your Committee that I needed not, at any time, "a motive distinct from self-vindication," satisfactorily to account for my conduct in this business."

If your Committee should be inclined to make a distinction in favor of Mr. Adams, for having written his separate letter from Ghent, relating to the secret doings of the mission, directly to his father, and indirectly to his father's confidant, and that mine was written directly to the government, and for it only: because, whatever may be the opinion of your Committee on the comparative abstract propriety of selecting, as we did, our respective correspondents, still, from the letter of Mr. Adams not being addressed *directly* to the government, your Committee may be disposed to acquit him of having, by his confidence in his father, and thence in Mr. Lloyd, violated his assertion, that I only had addressed the *government*, or justified myself to it. You shall see! And although your Committee could not have made this discovery by *all the lights of the book*, yet will you not acknowledge it to be the less wonderful.

The copy, or the duplicate, or the triplicate, or whatever it might be, as printed in the book, of the letter of Mr. Lloyd, of the 8th of March, 1815, as addressed to Mr. John Adams, is but a wretched mutilated fragment of the ori-

gnal letter that was thus addressed. This *original*, to my surprise, I found at Washington, in 1817, in the Department of State. The sire, it seems, not satisfied with transmitting Mr. Lloyd's prodigious production to London, as requested, that his son might know something about the fisheries and the Mississippi, should that practised statesman thereafter have occasion to treat about them, but he sent that letter, about the same time, to our own government, incidentally, no doubt, to instruct them, but mainly to vindicate the son as *one* of the majority, at Ghent, on this question, and insidiously to denounce the minority. Mr. Lloyd probably assented to his letter being so employed, as the mutilated fragment, if not fashioned by him to abuse me, was so published by *his express permission*. (Page 209.)

I need not now ask your Committee, I trust, if they still doubt my sufficient motive for self-vindication, or now consider the assertion of Mr. Adams, "that no other member of the mission had thought it necessary to vindicate his own vote" but me.

I will detain your Committee a little longer with Mr. Lloyd's letter, in its *various* shapes. I found the copy of the original, as I have stated, in the Department of State; and the excellent Mr. Graham, who was then Chief Clerk of that Department, afforded me an opportunity to procure a copy. Such a copy I now send you, and they can compare it with that in the Department of State, should it have survived all the changes there. I send you, too, a transcript of *the fragment*, from the book, that some of your Committee, who appear well qualified for the task, may critically examine the *whole* of both; and although they may not descend to *note* the differences of punctuation between them, yet it is in justice, will not allow to escape them the essential *corrections, variations, or discrepancies*. They will remember that this fragment is a *document*, not only published in the book, by *special permission*, to furnish *testimony* to prove that the *liberty* of taking fish within British jurisdiction is much more valuable than the freedom of navigating the Mississippi within ours, but was specially drawn forth on this occasion, as "a French rapier," for the chivalrous purpose of making a deadly thrust at me! Lest, however, none of your Committee may be immediately at leisure, to attend to this undertaking, I will give you a short specimen of the notable variations between the copy printed in the book, and the copy found in the Department, which may be expected from *a thorough comparison of both*.

The very first stride, stretches as far as the limits of the *two* papers would admit. It consists in taking the *date from the very bottom* of the copy of the *original*, and placing it at the *very top of the other thing*. Then, and not far from the beginning, you will find the specimen promised:

Copy in the Department.	*Copy in the Book.*
"The causes of its value and importance not being a matter of greater notoriety here, are obvious. It was an employment not only in the fishing, but in many instances undoubtedly in trade, *and in an illicit trade* with the British inhabitants, *in which, independently of the dread of competition, one of the inherent attributes of commerce, publicity was most carefully to be avoided.* Those, *therefore*, who were engaged in it, made no unnecessary promulgation of their employment, while their *coadjutors*, the poorer inhabitants of the provinces, tasting equally its sweets and advantages, were alike disposed to keep silence with regard to it. But so situated were *not* the Provincial Governments, and the more wealthy of the merchants of the seaport towns. They had become highly alarmed at the expansion of this fishery and trade, jealous of its progress, and clamorous at its endurance. *The former saw their own consequence abridged; their revenue interrupted; their people alienated, envying the privileges and advantages of a neighboring nation, which their own systems would not permit them to enjoy, & witnessing the famous navigation act, the chief anchor of their commercial supremacy, rendered, in its local operation at least, a dead letter.* They, therefore, of late years," &c.	"The causes of its value and importance not being a matter of great notoriety here, are obvious; it was an employment not only in the fishery, but, in many instances, undoubtedly in *trade* with the British inhabitants. Those who were engaged in it made no unnecessary promulgations of their employment, while the poorer inhabitants of the provinces, tasting equally its sweets and advantages, were alike disposed to keep silence with regard to it; but *not* so situated were the provincial governments and the more wealthy of the merchants of the seaport towns. They had become highly alarmed at the expansion of this fishery and trade; jealous of its progress, and clamorous at its endurance; they, therefore, of late years," &c.

It has not been without regret, that I ave perceived your committee apparent- give credit to the statements of Mr. dams, however contradictory in his ook, concerning the share which I took the discussion of the fishing question Ghent. As the most satisfactory mode f correcting the impression which you ay thus erroneously have received, I end you, herewith, that part f my cor- espondence with William H. Crawford, Esq., then ar Minister at Paris, which ook place at that time between us in re- ation to that subject. This part of the orrespondence may not only give you ome notion of the whole of that corres- ondence, but of the general manner in hich I attended to the discharge of my uties. (No. 2.)

Your committee will be able to judge, rom what has here already been said, by whom the mysteries of ruin were brew- ng, from the signature of the treaty of Ghent, and if, indeed, I did first *make* an ccasion for informing Mr. Monroe that I vas in the minority, and then, in accord- nce with such information, write, *gratu- tously*, a long letter from Paris. I can ssure your committee that I contrived o plot with Mr. Clay, or he with me, t Ghent or Paris, either for his elevation r the depression of Mr. Adams. Al- hough I should have supposed myself, *at hat time*, to have been sufficiently in the onfidence of Mr. Clay for such a com- munication, yet he never intimated to me ny project or even wish of political ad- ancement or aggrandizement—nor did ever hear him hint, at that time, any elfish view on the Department of State. As to myself, your committee do me egre- ious wrong when they insinuate, that I vas concerting the exaltation of Mr. Clay and the prostration of Mr. Adams, s "my interest, they say, could only ave been contingent upon the success f Mr. Clay." Whatever mystery there ight have been in all this, must have owed its existence exclusively to the ex- uberant imagination of your committee, warmed, perhaps, by the inspiration of he scriptures of Mr. Adams. I could ot know, nor did I believe at the time Mr. Clay left Europe to return to the United States, that Mr. Monroe would e the next President, and, of course, I ould not suspect that any competition existed between two of my late col- leagues for the Department of State, un- der him.

Mr. Clay had certainly, during our of- ficial association, maintained all the ele- vation which my pre-conceived opinion of his talents, patriotism, and political principles had assigned him. While, however, I sincerely believed he deserv- ed well of the republic, I neither felt, nor do I believe, that he considered me as his partisan. Whatever might have been his future plans of ambition, they were not confided to me.

On the other hand, Mr. Adams, whom I was prepared, by his reputation, to meet a great man, proved to be one of those peculiar objects which distance magnifies, but which dwindle as they are approached. He had loomed through a hazy atmosphere; but, as the welkin brightened, shrunk to his true dimensions. Instead of being satisfied with common sense, he often aspired, abortively, to dis- play what is styled genius, and an effort to produce the prodigious frequently re- sulted in the ridiculous. A chaos of lite- rature, acquired by incessant labor, tend- ed rather too obscure than to enlighten the understanding. And where I expected to find the principles of the patriot and the wisdom of the sage, I found only crude prejudices and ungoverned pas- sions. Although disappointed in my an- ticipations of Mr. Adams, I honestly shook him by the hand, when, after the treaty of Ghent, I parted with him at Paris; and if ever I had wondered at his singular good fortune, in his political ca- reer, I certainly wished him no ill. It was only during the ensuing autumn that I was induced, by information received from the United States, to write to Mr. Clay my letter in answer to the one an- nexed. The letter sufficiently explains its own object.

Letter from Mr. Clay to Mr. Russell.

LONDON, 10*th May*, 1815.

MY DEAR SIR: I understand, with re- gret, that you were dissatisfied with me for not writing to you from this place on the subject of the interview with Lord Castle- reagh, adverted to in a letter which I wrote to Mr. Crawford. I did not write to you, for two reasons: first, because nothing oc- curred in the interview worth communica- ting; and secondly, because I did not ex- pect, if I did write, that my letter would find you at Paris.

Subsequent to Mr. Gallatin's arrival, we had, at Lord Castlereagh's request, a second interview with him of more im- portance. The first topic to which he referred, was the firing upon the Ameri- can prisoners at Dartmoor. Contradic- tory accounts from the British authori- ties and the American prisoners had been

received, as to the causes of that unfortunate event. He proposed, to ascertain the real truth of the case, that a joint inquiry should be instituted at the instance of the two governments; and to give it more solemnity, also proposed that it should be conducted by one of us and one of the British Commissioners, who negotiated the treaty of Ghent. If the recurrence to force had been improper, he assured us that the British officers should be brought to punishment. We stated that our powers did not authorize any interference on our part; that Mr. Beasley was alone competent to the required interposition; and that the most we could do, was to advise him. We added, that for these and other reasons, neither of us could conduct the inquiry. Concurring, however, as we did, in the propriety of a thorough investigation, we advised Mr. B. to co-operate in that object, and recommended him to appoint for that purpose Mr. C. King, a son of Mr. Rufus King, who was here. The result has been, a report from Mr. King and his British colleague, by which it would appear, that the firing, in the first instance, was perhaps justifiable, but that it was conducted in a most unjustifiable manner, was continued unnecessarily, and in some instances with wantonness. I understand, (though we have not yet been officially told,) that some further proceedings are to take place.

The next subject mentioned by Lord Castlereagh, was the transportation to America of the American prisoners, about 6000, in England. Our government, it seems, interprets the article in the treaty of Ghent which relates to the restoration of prisoners, to mean that each party, at his own proper expense, is to return the prisoners of the other to their country. This construction is objected to by this government. He proposed to transport the prisoners in England at the joint expense of the two governments, and to reserve the question for future arrangement. On this, as on the other subject, we stated that we had no powers: but we advised Mr. Beasley to accede to the proposed arrangement, and it is now in a course of execution.

The last, and the only topic in which we had any immediate concern, noticed by Lord Castlereagh, was the communication made by the joint commission at Ghent, of their powers to negotiate a commercial treaty. Lord Castlereagh said, that before he answered that communication, he would like to ascertain, by an official conversation, if it were likely that some general principles could be agreed on to form the basis of such a treaty. He proposed, for this purpose, that an interview should take place between the British Commissioners who were at Ghent, and the Vice-President of the Board of Trade, (the President being absent,) and us; we objected, that such a conversation would be on a footing of inequality, (we having powers and the other party none,) unless it were understood that the requisite powers should be granted to the same persons, if there were a probability of any practical result; which Lord C. said was certainly his understanding. We were told that four or five days would be necessary for them to prepare for the interview, which we consented should take place.

Thus matters remained for more than three weeks, without our receiving any notice that they were ready for the interview. Having been invited to dine with Lord C. on Sunday next, we thought the opportunity a good one to give a hint of our intention to wait no longer, and declined accepting it, on the ground that we had fixed our departure to a preceding day.

Being in the House of Commons the day before yesterday, the Vice-President of the Board of Trade came to me, and after expressing his regret at the delay, which he said was unavoidable, owing to the pressure of business, stated that they would be ready to meet us on Thursday next, if it would be convenient to us. Last night I received a note requesting an interview on that day, which we have agreed to.

As I intend to keep this letter open to inform you of the result, I will make no speculations on the probable issue of this business.

The prospect of renewed war in Europe, on which the allies appear to be resolved, renders it extremely desirable that the impressment question should be arranged, and perhaps renders it eligible, to prevent collisions, by settling some other disputed points of a commercial nature.

We shall leave here on Friday or Saturday next, unless we find, from the interview, a prospect of doing good by remaining. The Neptune was to leave Havre, to which place she was ordered in consequence of Mr. Bayard's weak state, this day, and to reach Plymouth, if possible, by the 15th, where Mr. Crawford, now here, Mr. Gallatin, and I will join Mr. B.

Mr. G. says he shall not accept his appointment, and Mr. B., I understand, will also decline his.

Mr. Adams remains at Paris, waiting his credentials, which I am told have arrived.

We have received no despatch from government to the joint commission. It was expected, at Washington, that none would find us in Europe.

Papers from America to the 10th April have been received here, but I do not now recollect any thing in them worth communicating.

1st July.

I have thus long kept open my letter to inform you of the result of our negotiation. Without troubling you with useless details, I will observe, that Messrs. Robinson, Goulburn, and Dr. Adams having been commissioned to treat with us, after considerable discussion, we yesterday agreed finally upon the terms of a commercial convention, which is to be signed on Monday next. The two important provisions of it are, 1st. a mutual abolition of all discriminating duties on tonnage and on merchandise, with an agreement to admit the productions of the United States into the British European possessions, and vice versa, subject to no higher or other duties than are paid on similar articles of other foreign countries. 2dly. Our admission to the trade of British India, free from the restriction imposed by the unratified treaty of 1806 of a direct voyage from the United States to India. We could come to no agreement as to the West India trade, nor as to that with the British North American Colonies. The convention to last 4 years only from the signature.

On the subjects of Impressment, Blockade, Colonial trade, &c. we have not yet entered upon the negotiation. From a prospect of a speedy termination of the European war, I believe we shall not engage on those topics, but leave them to future considerations and to other hands. Relative to impressment, they make us strong assurances of guarding, in future, against causes of complaint on our part.

The Neptune sailed on the 18th ult. from Plymouth, carrying Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Bayard, whose death before he reaches America, I regret to inform you, was feared to be almost inevitable.

Mr. Gallatin and I shall leave here next week for Lapland, where we shall embark for the United States.

I am sick of Europe, and sicker of European politics. I will not trouble you with my distresses on this latter subject.

Make my respects to Lawrence, and believe me, sincerely, your friend, &c.

(Signed) H. CLAY.

Copy of a Letter from Mr. Russell to Mr. Clay, dated

Stockholm, *15th October*, 1815.

My Dear Sir: Your letter, begun on the 10th of May, and concluded on the 1st of July last, reached me, some time since. It is the more prized by me, as it is the only one I have received from my late colleagues since my departure from Paris, and of course contains the only authentic information that I have hitherto received, of the exercise of the joint powers for negotiating a commercial treaty with Great Britain.

I was extremely embarrassed previous to leaving Paris, in selecting the course which I ought to pursue. I was prepared to follow my duty whithersoever it might lead me, and to repair to London upon a reasonable prospect of the institution of a commercial negotiation there. In the state of doubt and uncertainty in which I found myself on this subject, I was indeed very solicitous to hear from you; and although it was rather too strong to say that I was *dissatisfied* with you for not writing me, yet I certainly regretted your silence. I believed, however, that you would have written me, had you discovered any disposition in the other party to enter into a commercial arrangement; and your not having, however, intimated, with other considerations to persuade me that no such arrangement could be made, and to determine me to return to my country.

We had never, before or after leaving Ghent, perceived the slightest disposition on the part of Great Britain to enter with us into a commercial negotiation, although *repeatedly* assailed by us on that subject. Lord Castlereagh, in an interview with Mr. Bayard at Paris, expressed himself very explicitly against the expediency of commercial treaties in general: thereby inducing Mr. Bayard to believe that there was no intention of concluding one with the United States. After the time had passed at which you had announced an expected interview with Lord Castlereagh at London, you wrote to Mr. Bayard without the faintest intimation of the result of that meeting, other than might be inferred from the inquiry which you made relative to the movements of the Neptune, and of the indication of your inten-

tion to embark at Liverpool, rather than to protract, on her account, your residence in England. These circumstances, added to your silence towards me, left no room to doubt that the joint mission had absolutely terminated; especially as the ratification of the treaty of peace, by the President and Senate, had been already known in Europe for nearly a month. I hope, therefore, that you may not only be satisfied of the correctness of my views, in my returning hither, and not participating in your labors at London, but that you will be disposed, should the occasion require it, to vindicate me herein, with those to whom I am responsible for my official conduct.

The treaty of commerce, which you have made, appears to me, as far as it goes, to be a good one. The provision which stipulates for the mutual abolition of the discriminating duties, I consider to be very important to us, and I can but regret that its operation is limited to the brief period of four years. This provision, however, is a great point gained, and may not only lead the way to a more permanent regulation on the subject with England herself, but will have a salutary influence on our negotiations with other nations. I am fully persuaded, from some experience and much observation, that the sagacity, skill, and enterprise of our fellow citizens, will always secure the ascendant in a free commercial competition, and that we shall always have the advantage in every advancement towards liberal principles. I hope that Great Britain will not make this discovery before the expiration of the four years. The provision relative to the trade with the British East Indies, so far as it frees us from the restriction of the direct voyage, is certainly a point gained, although the interests of Great Britain herself will, I doubt not, always guarantee to us a participation of that commerce. I was a little surprised that there was no provision in the treaty for the regulation of the intercourse between the United States and the British North American Colonies. If I remember correctly, the immediate necessity of such a provision was the chief, if not the *only ostensible* reason urged by Mr. Gallatin for pressing a commercial negotiation. I believe, however, that it will be always within our power to bring Great Britain to terms on that subject, and that it may be less difficult for us to prevent smugglers and Indian incendiaries, without a treaty on that point, than with one.

I have had much curiosity to know the various anecdotes which grew out of the negotiation at London. If any thing was agitated in relation to the navigation of the Mississippi, the fishing liberty, and Indian commerce, I should, indeed, have lamented my return to Sweden had it left you in the minority on these questions. As nothing, however, has been concluded with respect to them, I am reconciled to the course which I have pursued. As to the questions of maritime rights, I was aware that it was not the time to touch them to advantage.

If the government do not blame me for not having assisted at the commercial treaty, and I confidently trust it will not, I shall have nothing to regret. The responsibility and *disagremens* of the transaction were certain—the honor, even in case of a successful issue, precarious. Mr. **** and Mr. **** have both acquainted me that a very general opinion appeared to prevail in the United States, that the whole of the credit of the negotiation at Ghent, belonged to two *principal* members of the American mission. **** and **** had very good naturedly expressed their indignation at so unjust an opinion, and combated it accordingly. They were certainly very candid in doing so, and are entitled to the thanks of the three Commissioners whose reputation they attempted to vindicate. I believe, however, that public opinion is not long unjust, and that at last it generally corrects itself. They do not mention the names of the two great personages, and thus, perhaps, leave it to our vanity to designate them. It might be fair enough, therefore, for you and me to claim this distinction, if it were not too obvious that some little pitiful tricks had been practised to create it. Of these I know we are both incapable; and I am obliged, therefore, for your sake and my own, to renounce our claims to this monopoly of public applause. It is a pity, indeed, that the public should be deceived on this occasion: not so much because its error is injurious to us, as this would perhaps be an evil of very limited extent; but because it gives a false and factitious importance to others, which may be abused in their race for popularity to unrighteous purposes, in which the whole nation is concerned. If, therefore, the person who has found it somewhat difficult to support the reputation of great talents by the production of any thing great in the department which he has administered; who shrunk from the duties of that department

on the first approach of difficulty: whose political firmness and integrity are at least equivocal, and whose origin proscribes him in the honest prejudices of the nation, should, in despair of exercising directly himself the powers of the Chief Magistracy, seek for some convenient individual to fill that station, whom he might manage and control, and move as *a showman his puppets at Paris:* If the individual thus sought, should be a kind of laborious pedant, without judgment enough to be useful, or taste sufficient to be admired; who is suspected of forgetting his country in the pursuit of little personal or family interests; and who is known frequently to forget himself in a paroxysm of unmanageable passion; who has had the virtue to mask his participation in the resentments of his father, under the affectation of patriotism, and the patriotism to desert his party when it had lost its power; who adopts the most extravagant opinions in the heat of the moment, and defends them with obstinacy and vehemence while the fever lasts, and thus reduces himself to the miserable alternative of being constantly absurd or ridiculously inconsistent; who has neither dignity to command, nor address to persuade, and is therefore as unqualified to rule others as he is to govern himself; who believes the national prosperity to consist in the prosperity of a district, and circumscribes his love of country within the confines of the State in which he was born; who would barter the patriotic blood of the West for blubber, and exchange ultra-Alleghany scalps for codfish; who inherits "a vanity without bounds, and a jealousy that discolors every thing"—who——But enough! I say if all this should be so—and these two men should have formed a felonious conspiracy to cheat themselves into public favor, by filching from their late colleagues their well-earned proportion of fame—ought we not, how little soever we may value the stolen goods, to drag the thieves to justice, and to prevent them from converting our property to the purchase of dangerous and unmerited influence?

When I recollect the supercilious arrogance of these men, I am not at all surprised at their exclusive pretensions. The one appeared continually to consider himself as a kind of itinerant member of the Cabinet, and to bear about with him a portion of the sovereign power. He frequently conducted as if he felt rather the right of giving instructions, than the obligation of obeying them: and his colleagues found it necessary, on more than one occasion, to remind him of their equality, and to restrain him within the bounds of his duty. The other, either from alphabetical priority, or accident, having been first named in the commission, fastidiously claimed rank on every occasion. He was as ambitious of the honors of the dinner table, as he was of those of the council board, and undeviatingly *placed himself* at the head of both. He not only assumed the right of being the organ of our oral communications, in which situation I more than once blushed for him and for ourselves; but he claimed, and forcibly kept, against a vote of the commission, the possession of its official archives.

Notwithstanding, however, the characteristic presumption which betrayed itself in their exclusive pretensions, the pretensions themselves are not the less unfounded and inadmissible. What would have become of the rights and honor of the country, if they had depended alone on the narrow and time-serving policy of a man who sought for peace as a financial expedient, and appeared still to tremble at the hollow groans of the Treasury, which, in its distress, he had abandoned. A man who, always inclining to the side of concession, was absolutely borne through the negotiation by the firmness of his colleagues; who sought to obtain the possible, but paltry difference between specie and current money, in the liquidation of advances which might have been made for the maintenance of prisoners, with more zeal than he had resisted the most extravagant demands asserted by the enemy; and who, after having explicitly avowed that the contested liberty of the fisheries was no equivalent for the free navigation of the Mississippi, not only insisted that the latter should be offered in consideration of the former, but actually himself made this offer to the British Commissioners, in a manner unexpected and unauthorized by at least a majority of his colleagues. Peace, at any rate, was his object: and taking counsel of his nerves, he appeared to be prepared to pay for it in any thing excepting specie.

And what would have become of the peace itself, thus inordinately sought for by one of these men, had it been intrusted to the wild eccentricity and intemperate caprice of the other? This last had so precipitately made up his judgment on the existing circumstances, that he not only pronounced a peace to be impracticable, but, on leaving Stockholm, intimated the uncertainty of his proceeding

further than Gothemburg, as he acknowledged neither the utility or obligation of acquiescing in the location of the Congress at Ghent. If the peevish declamation that he had prepared in answer to the very first note of the British Commissioners, had been sanctioned by his colleagues, it must have put an end to the last hope of accommodation. It had, indeed, rather the tone of an impassioned manifesto on the final rupture of a stormy and unsuccessful negotiation, than a diplomatic communication, made at the very threshold of a discussion for peace, with a view of attaining that object. Although the greater part of this performance was unhesitatingly expunged, and the spirit of the rest greatly chastened, yet the folly of a single sentence, that was indiscreetly spared by a kind of mistaken charity, was a source to us of infinite vexation and labor. This sentence itself was, indeed, corrected and qualified; and, instead of preferring a direct charge against the adverse party, of "the rapacity of ambition," was permitted to insinuate only "a desire of aggrandizement." This insinuation, however, provoked our adversaries to a retort which put us on the defensive, during almost the whole of the remainder of the negotiation. If the rhapsodies of this man had not abortively perished from the fever in which they were generated, they would have abruptly terminated the discussions, or at least have deprived them of that collected firmness and dignity which constitute their proudest merit. We might, indeed, by those rhapsodies, have dazzled the vulgar with a blaze of tropes and figures, worthy of a Professor of Belles Lettres, but we must have renounced all pretension to the character of sober and enlightened statesmen. Never, perhaps, was there a negotiation at which the merit of *correction* so much exceeded that of composing. What a tawdry and slovenly appearance should we have made before the public, had there been found none among us to have ripped off our French embroidery, and to have washed our dirty linen! It was not, however, in our solemn official communications with the British ministers, only, that we were annoyed with the obtrusive pedantry of the person now in question; but our deliberations among ourselves were constantly embarrassed, and sometimes suspended by them. Did he not, on one occasion, drive his colleagues from the Board, by superciliously and pertiaciously insisting that the former treaty of peace should be cited as of 1782, and not of 1783? Have we not *frequently* known him most inconsistently to oppose, to-day, with ardor, the proposition of which he was yesterday the warm advocate, and perhaps the mover? to blow, within the four-and-twenty hours, with equal violence, from every point of the compass? and at one moment to *energize* on trifles, and, at the next, to treat as trifles, matters of the utmost importance?

Shall these men, who were thus respectively exposed, by their fears, to have concluded a treaty without honor, or, by their whimsical violence, to have defeated the conclusion of any treaty, be allowed to engross the credit which is mainly owing to the firmness and temper of their colleagues, and be permitted to abuse this credit to purposes disgraceful and disastrous to the country?

Mr. [redacted] is known to be opposed to the election of Mr. Monroe, or of any other able and independent man to the Presidency. He had designated Governor Tompkins for that office, until he was aware that the project was impracticable. He has, therefore, it seems, now determined to make an experiment of Mr. Adams; and, at once to indulge his own vanity, and to give to the experiment some chance of success, he has very honestly consented to share with him the whole honor of the negotiation at Ghent. Already is Mr. Adams nominated as a candidate for the Presidency in the newspapers of the United States; and he has, according to my information from London, obviously elevated his ambition to that object. Now, as an American, as a republican, as a New England man, I solemnly enter my protest against his election. He is entirely unqualified for the station, and, like his father, he will be sure to ruin any party that shall attempt to support him. He has no talent to manage others, and Mr. [redacted] would very soon discover that he is totally unmanageable himself. Wherever there is a great and evident disparity in the qualifications of rival candidates, mere local prejudice ought to have no weight. If, however, such a prejudice is to be regarded, still it can afford no assistance to the pretensions of Massachusetts. She has already had her full proportion of Presidents and Vice-Presidents, and can assert no just claim at the ensuing election. To take the next President from that State, would be to sanction, and not to correct, the sectional arrogance which causes all this clamor. Such a proceeding would not have even the effect to conciliate that factious portion of the

Union. It is a Federalist, and not a New England man, which the disaffected desire; and Mr. Adams would not have a single vote in his native state. The majority of that State detest his past apostacy, and the minority have doubts of his future faith. By his election nothing would be gained; but by it the peace and dignity of the country, and the very existence of the republican party, would become the sport of freak and violence; and not only a preposterous sacrifice be made to local jealousy, but an invidious step taken towards family aggrandizement.

I must now apologize for having detained you with so long a dissertation; but I could not feel entirely at my ease until I had deposited my sentiments on this subject, in some friendly bosom, and I believed it was not lawful for me to speak of the mysteries of the negotiation except to the initiated. I disclaim all interested views in what I have written. I am sufficiently rewarded for any share which I may have had in bringing our labors to an honorable issue, by the consciousness of having discharged my duty to the best of my abilities; and it imports me little where the credit is bestowed, provided it does not become an instrument of presumptuous ambition. I have given you my testimony, *in perpetuam memoriam rei*, that should I be destined soon to follow our worthy and sincerely lamented colleague, Mr. Bayard, you may not be left a solitary witness to the truth.

I observe that you are sick of Europe and European politics. I can assure you that I am sincerely so; at least I am heartily tired of Sweden, and would most cheerfully exchange the public trust committed to me here, for the humble comforts of private life. I find it indispensable to my happiness, to have my children about me, and it is impossible to bring them to this dreary region, destitute of all means of education. Will you inquire confidentially of the President, if Mr. [redacted] has made to him the promised communication on this subject, and will you use your friendly offices to obtain permission for me to lay down my functions here? I should be truly wretched if I believed that my residence at Stockholm would be protracted beyond the ensuing summer. Do not mistake me—I ask only for the liberty of leaving Sweden.

Mr. Lawrence has already applied to the Secretary of State, for permission to return to America, and is in daily expectation of receiving it. Although I could not oppose this proceeding, yet I am afraid it may embarrass the accomplishment of my own wishes. It may, perhaps, be inexpedient to terminate, at once, this legation, and after the departure of Mr. Lawrence, there can be found no person in this quarter of Europe, qualified to receive the trust from me. If, therefore, I shall be permitted to leave this country, of which I will not doubt, it may be well to appoint, immediately, another Secretary, who will be competent to remain as Chargé d'Affaires—or to appoint, at once, a Minister to succeed me. The former mode of procedure would be least exceptionable towards this court, unless my successor should be a Minister Plenipotentiary, which I candidly confess to you, I think altogether inexpedient. The expectation that the negotiation for peace would be entertained at Gothemburg, and that the good offices of this government might have had a beneficial influence on the result, was certainly, at the time, a justification of the appointment of a Minister Plenipotentiary. Such a reason, however, no longer exists; and neither the actual rank of the Swedish Minister in the United States, nor the ordinary relations between the two countries, require us to accredit here more than a Minister of the third order. I leave entirely to your good judgment and friendly disposition towards me, to suggest herein whatever you may deem best calculated to promote my object. I have not only written you already too long a letter to add any thing on European politics, but I am too much disgusted with the subject, to turn willingly towards it my attention.

I congratulate you sincerely on the glorious termination of the war with Algiers, and I personally rejoice at the part which His Owyheen Excellency has had in the transaction. He is really an intelligent, worthy fellow, although a brother-in-law was preferred for a confidential mission to Vienna.

I am not without fear that you were within the range of the terrible storm that so rudely treated the Jamaica fleet, on the 9th of August. I calculate much, however, on your *good luck*, and I hope soon to be relieved from all solicitude, by hearing of your safe arrival. If you will pardon the affrightful length of this letter, you may be assured of my being more reasonable in future. Remember me, I pray you, to Mr. Crawford, and believe me, faithfully and cordially, your friend.

(Signed) JONA: RUSSELL.

On my return to America, I visited Washington in the beginning of the year 1817. Mr. Monroe had then actually been elected President, and his cabinet not yet finally arranged. It was said that a Secretary for the Department of State had not yet been definitively selected, and that Mr. Clay and Mr. Adams were considered as competitors for that appointment. At the suggestion of the *former*, I with zeal urged the superiority of his claims. That I could do so honestly and sincerely, without any necessity of long preparation by previous intrigue, my respective opinions of the two men, here unfolded, will sufficiently warrant. Mr. Monroe preferred Mr. Adams, and has since, undoubtedly, informed him that I had been the advocate of his rival, for I have seen this recommendation of Mr. Clay arrayed against me as a most heinous political transgression. I should believe Mr. Adams himself, might now, on consulting his own Secretary of State, find for it some palliation.

After the spring of 1817, until the commencement of the year 1822, I did not meet again with Mr. Clay. He was not then in Congress, but was paying a visit at Washington, on private business. I often saw him then, and, I believe, at our first interview, he told me, and before I had received any intimation in any other way, that he should allow himself to be proposed as one of the candidates at the next election for President. He gave me, at the same time to understand, that his prospects of success were promising. I was really too much his friend to suffer him to deceive himself for an instant, with respect to the aid which he might, on that occasion, expect from me. I accordingly told him, frankly, and without hesitation, that already I had definitively determined to lend all my feeble support to Mr. Crawford, and could do him no good. I expressed a hope, however, that our relations of personal friendship might receive no prejudice from this avowal. He assured me, with much apparent cordiality, that it should not; nor could I remark, at our subsequent interviews during his stay at Washington, at that time, any cause to distrust this assurance, although our conversation necessarily became less confidential in what specially concerned himself.

Your committee assert, that "had not the alterations in my DUPLICATE rendered me *unpopular*, there is little doubt that I would have been backed and sustained by all Mr. Clay's weight and influence." However I had regretted the loss of Mr. Clay's weight and influence, from any cause whatsoever, yet I have been inclined to believe, that the "alterations," assigned by your committee, were merely the *pretext* for that loss: but that the *efficient cause* of rendering his "weight and influence" not only negative, with regard to me, but for converting them into means of hostility against me, was the frank avowal I had, rashly perhaps, confided to his over-rated personal friendship for me. He could not, it seems, employ his "weight and influence" to protect me from injustice, unless I would use mine to make him President.

I am not ignorant, and I have sincerely regretted, that the efforts of my political enemies to misrepresent me, had so far succeeded as to prejudice some against me who had no special interest in my destruction, and whose good opinion I highly cherished.

I had believed that I had remained entirely master of my own defence for my doings at Ghent, unshackled by parliamentary forms. Of the call of the House which procured the communication of the letter containing that defence, I had not, as I have stated elsewhere, the slightest intimation, directly or indirectly, of any intention to make it—any thing certified to the contrary notwithstanding. When, however, that call had actually been made, I felt a solicitude, as already stated, to produce my defence. As I had found Mr. Lloyd's *private* letter in the Department of State, which denounced the minority and vindicated the other side of the question, I thought it but fair to presume that my private letter from Paris, on the other side, might be found in the same place. Real or pretended search was, however, for a long time, made for it there in vain. It was then suggested, that Mr. Monroe, who, from Secretary of State had been made President, had kept it in his possession. I accordingly inquired of him after it. He countenanced the supposition of his having retained possession of it, and engaged to look after it. I frequently called afterwards on him, to learn the success of his search; and when I despaired of its being in his power or his convenience to find it, I procured it from my home, where it might still have remained, had it not been for the call of the House. It was nearly seven years that I had not looked at it, and when I came to examine it, I believed it might be slightly corrected with advantage to the public, for whom

it had not been written. I certainly felt no more restraint in thus correcting it for communication to the public through the House, than I should have felt as a member of the House, to amend a speech for communication to the public through the press. It was my own *private* letter, containing my own special defence: and if communicated at all, I believed it ought to be communicated in what *shape* I pleased. Under this impression, I so amended it, and went with it to the Department of State, where, as Mr. Adams was not in his office, I left it with the Chief Clerk. I called a second time without finding Mr. Adams: at my third call he was there.

I had always intended to state to him the differences between the copy which I had kept, and the paper, which, at the suggestion of the Chief Clerk, had been called *duplicate*. If I had not made the two papers *verbatim* alike—I had made them alike *true*.

After I began a short conversation upon another subject, he abruptly adverted to the paper which I had left some days before at the office. His first remarks discovered that the original, which before had so long been sought for in vain, had now been found without difficulty. He commented in his own way: and "his language of decency," not being copious enough to express all he seemed to feel, I was obliged to tell him that I was not aware of there being any thing material in the differences, and that certainly nothing offensive could have been intended. He interrupted me with one of his habitual paroxysms, menacing to communicate both papers, with his remarks, which took from me the inclination to carry into effect the purpose for which I had called—to state and explain the differences, and leave the whole at his disposal—and I repeat, "destroyed in me even a wish to conciliate or appease him." The man whose whole political life, since his disclosures to Mr. Giles, is a tissue of imposture, would have told me, if he dared, that I had attempted to deceive the Department. When I rose to leave him, he rose too, and then said, what he seems desirous in his book I should repeat, and which I cheerfully do, for the special edification of your committee. "This," he said, still struggling with passion, "shall make no difference in the *official* communications between us, but I never wish to have any personal intercourse with you again." Then, (said I,) stretching towards him my hand, which he thought best to accept, "*I will bid you an eternal farewell.*" And did indeed leave him accordingly, officially as well as personally.

I immediately waited on the President, and found the Secretary of the Navy with him—I informed him, forthwith, of the interview I had just had with Mr. Adams, and that Mr. Adams had made himself very angry with the two papers, and threatened to cause both to be communicated to the House, in order that he might have an opportunity of making *his remarks* on the variance between them. I told Mr. Monroe that I was willing that either or neither of the papers should be communicated; but I felt a repugnance that the ill-nature of Mr. Adams should be indulged with his contemplated communication of *both*. Mr. Monroe, in reply, assured me that he would consent to communicate *neither*—for he would not "*consent to become* the organ of personal hostility."

With this assurance, I retired satisfied—but as I crossed the saloon, outward, I passed, at a respectful distance, Mr. Adams, who was entering—and I doubt not, at this visit, he *persuaded* the President to forget the assurance he had given me but a few minutes before, and now to consent to communicate to the House all that Mr. Adams desired.

Such are the details of this transaction, most of which I communicated to Mr. Clay, as long ago as the seventh of August, 1822, in a letter of that date, a copy of which I herewith send you. The letter was in answer to one from him of the 9th of July, which had been received, in answer to a letter from me of the 6th of June, both of the same year, and copies of both you will find also enclosed.

My letter of the 7th of August, commences thus—"I received by the last mail, your letter of the 9th ult. All the abuse of Mr. Adams and his satellites has not given me so much pain as the mild intimation of your disapprobation. What is done cannot be undone. My greatest error, however, has been at placing any confidence in the candor of Mr. Adams. It was my intention to have acquainted him with the variations, and to have left him with this knowledge, free to act as he might think proper. It was for this purpose I called at the department with the exact copy in my pocket, but before I saw him, he and the President had found the original, and the mischief was done. The coarse and violent manner in which he introduced the subject, made it impossible for me to deprecate his hostility, by declaring

the intention with which I had called on him. Such a declaration, under such circumstances, indeed, was not only repugnant to my feelings, but would have been worse than useless, and merely exposed me to an additional affront. I now make this declaration to you, because *you are my friend*, but, on the rack, I would not make it to my enemies. After this explosion with Mr. Adams, I called on Mr. Monroe, and stated to him what had been my intentions, and my willingness that either paper should be communicated, or neither—and he emphatically assured me that *neither* should be communicated to the House, as he would not *become the organ of personal hostility*—yet *two* days afterwards he sent his strange message of the 4th of March, which took from him all control over the proceedings.

Thus much for "the duplicate:" and although I am aware it has been judged hardly, I will not believe that when all the facts are known, it can do me, as Mr. Clay unkindly intimated, "a lasting prejudice."

In his letter of the 4th of September, a copy of which I also transmit, herewith, he attempts "to sooth my feeling," by saying—"I have no doubt you were dealt with by the persons to whom you refer, *with great duplicity*, and that *one* of them even sought to produce the *very state of things which exists*." This letter, although still professing friendship, wanted all the warm-heartedness of our friendship of former times—yet I would not believe that these professions were entirely hollow—when, afterwards, I saw him not only make his peace with his political rival and my personal enemy, but enter his service and do his dirty work, I still thought my heart was chilled, could not suppose he had been my enemy ever since I had declined to aid his pretensions to the Presidency. It was his letter to Mr. Amos Kendall, of the 23d of June, 1822, published in the United States' Telegraph, of the 21st July last, to which I refer your committee, that not only like an assassin thrust in the dark, severed the last bond that bound me to him, and dissipated the lingering delusion which made me still hope well of him, and almost forgive him—but consummated the metamorphosis which he had been gradually undergoing from the fair form of light, in which I had once delighted to revere him, into a monster of darkness and deformity. About the very time he was condoling me, on the duplicity of others, he was himself acting with the most revolting duplicity towards me. In that letter to Mr. Kendall, notwithstanding his simultaneous professions of friendship to me, he was virtually taking part against me, in my controversy with Mr. Adams, by prognosticating the incurable wounds his venomed shafts would inflict: and had thus turned "prophet of plagues," and thus "boded ill," that he might, forsooth, escape all suspicion of having any *agency* in bringing forth my letters, which he pronounces so unworthy of him, as to be beneath the notice of himself or his friends. I know not, as I have said, to whom that agency can be justly ascribed—but is Mr. Clay quite sure that he is entirely innocent of it? He charges me, too, with making myself the prominent person in opposing the Mississippi proposition. He knew that I never intended doing him that injustice. He charges me, too, of not naming him, and keeping out of view his strenuous opposition, and says, "the truth is, that I did not know that such a letter was in existence." All this was done, too, to avoid the odious suspicion of any agency in the call which brought out that letter.

Now I had read that letter to Mr. Clay, in Paris, immediately after it was written, and although he had no share in its composition, he approved on hearing it, the general views it had taken, and found no fault with not having been named in it. In my letter to him of the 6th of June, I say to him—"I showed you at the time, the letter which I wrote at Paris, and you coincided with me in the grounds there taken for our opposition—I shall state this fact, and I hope, should the occasion require, you will confirm it." In reply to that letter he says, on the 9th of July following: "Your letter, which I believe you showed me at Paris, I suppose was written to explain the grounds on which you had proceeded: and was to be used defensively upon the possible contingency of a misrepresentation or misconception of your course—no such contingency had occurred." This distinctly admits the truth of my assertion, made in the Boston Statesman of the 27th June, 1822, "that the only member of the mission who had a direct interest in the case, I did show at the time, the letter written at Paris," and justifies the inference of Mr. Kendall, that this "member" was Mr. Clay.

On the strange assertions of Mr. Clay, in his letter to Mr. Kendall, I make no further comment. It has convinced me that Mr. Clay could never have pro-

fessed friendship for me but with interested purposes, and that he could desert me without an effort, rather than hazard a particle of his popularity by exposing himself to the suspicion of being my friend. The letter of Mr. Clay to Mr. Kendall, is one of the circumstances, referred to in the commencement of this letter, which has induced me to make this communication to you.

It is with deep humiliation I have felt myself deceived in the noble and generous nature of Henry Clay—the reptile crawl and the viper sting, which could unite the abject and the venomous, would not have surprised me in John Quincy Adams—but I had indeed looked up for a more ethereal and exhilirating course from Henry Clay.

Your Committee will, I trust, from the communication which I have now addressed to you, acquit me of having contrived any plot, with Mr. Clay, from the signature of the treaty of Ghent, or at any subsequent epoch, for the destruction of Mr. Adams, which can have issued in so marvellous a catastrophe.

All the mystery which can really have brewed, is that, which, by the strange compound and heterogeneous ingredients, has produced the agitated mass of corruption, which, in the violence of its fermentation, has brought from the bottom to the surface, the political incubus which now bestrides and oppresses this Republic.

I pray you, Sir, for yourself, and in behalf of your Committee, to accept my respectful salutations.

JONA: RUSSELL.

APPENDIX.

Copy of a letter from James Lloyd to John Adams, as contained in John Quincy Adams' book.

BOSTON, *8th March*, 1815.

"SIR: In a former note, returning the letter with which you had so obligingly favored me, I had the honor to offer you my congratulations on the termination of the war, without waiting to know what were the grounds of the treaty which concluded it; because, from the tenor of the previous correspondence, and my personal knowledge of nearly all the Commissioners, I felt a reliance that the arrangement would not be dishonorable, although I acknowledge my rejoicing was mingled with fear least it should be, at least in some points, a disadvantageous one; and this expression of feeling I volunteered with the more readiness, as the intelligence was received at a moment when the national character had been splendidly illustrated by the recent achievement at New Orleans.

"But I greeted the occurrence with smiles, principally, not because I expected it would bring or restore to us all the benefits we possessed under former treaties, but because I saw no chance, but from this source, of happier prospects for the future. It was not, however, the storm that howled along the lakes, or upon the sea-board, that created the apprehension of an instant for the fate of the contest, but it was the hidden fire that was rumbling within our own bosoms, and which, under the continuance of the war, would, I believe, have made our country the theatre of domestic convulsions, as well as of foreign warfare, and perhaps from its effects have offered up some parts of it as no very difficult prey to the mercy of the enemy.

"On this hand, I know, Sir, you had better hopes and thought differently from me: and I have now only to say, I am glad the experiment has never come to issue.

"As the price of the purchase of an escape from evils portentous as these, I considered it as probable that the English government might claim from us the conteded eastern islands, and interdict all trade between us and her colonial possessions; and possibly still further, that she would endeavor to extort from us the coast fisheries around her own shores: for, on the magnanimity or friendship of Great Britain, or of any other nation, in matters of interest, I confess I never had the ability to lash my imagination into any sort of dependence; but I did also cherish the belief, that none of our essential or important rights or *liberties* would be diminished or surrendered. Of the latter, the one of the greatest consequence, in reference to its intrinsic value, and as derived from discovery and possession, and confirmed by a formal treaty stipulation, is unquestionably that to which you

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH.... *Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published, weekly until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar*; subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, NOVEMBER 1, 1828 No. 34.

have referred—the coast fisheries on the shores of the British possessions in North America.

"These fisheries, as most advantageously secured to the United States by the treaty of 1783, and made, at the time, as I have always understood, a sine qua non of that treaty, offer an invaluable fund of wealth and power to our country; one which has never been duly attended to nor justly appreciated, but which, if continued and improved, was destined to grow with our growth and strengthen with our strength.

"The prosecution of these coast and bay fisheries, although it had already become extremely advantageous, had undoubtedly reached, in a very small degree, the extension and importance it was capable of attaining. The unsettled state of the commercial world for the past twenty years, and the more alluring objects of mercantile enterprise which such a state of things evolved, seemed in point of immediate consideration and attention, to throw these fisheries into the back ground; but still, until first checked by the system of embargoes and restrictions, and finally stopped by a declaration of war, they were silently, but rapidly progressing, and reaching an importance which, though generally unknown to our country and its statesmen, had become highly alarming to the governments and more wealthy merchants of the provinces, and was beginning to attract the attention and jealousy of the cabinet of Great Britain towards them.

"The shores, the creeks, the inlets of the Bay of Fundy, the Bay of Chaleurs, and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the Straits of Bellisle, and the Coast of Labrador, appear to have been designed by the God of Nature as the great ovarium of fish; the inexhaustible repository of this species of food, not only for the supply of the American but of the European continent. At the proper season, to catch them in endless abundance, little more of effort is needed than to bait the hook and pull the line, and occasionally, even this is not necessary. In clear weather, near the shores, myriads are visible, and the strand is at times almost literally paved with them.

"All this was gradually making itself known to the enterprise and vigilance of the New England fishermen, and for a few seasons prior to the year 1808, the resort to this employment had become an object of attention, from the Thames, at New London, to the Schoodic; and boats and vessels of a small as well as a large size, were flocking to it from all the intermediate parts of the United States. In the fishing season, at the best places for catching the cod, the New England fishermen, I am told, on a Sunday swarmed like flies upon the shores, and that in some of these years, it probably would not make an over-estimate to rate the number of vessels employed in this fishery, belonging to the United States, at from 1500 to 2000 sail, reckoning a vessel for each trip or voyage, and including the larger boat fishery; and the number, if the fisheries were continued, would shortly be still further and very greatly extended.

"The nursery for seamen, the consequent increase of power, the mine of wealth, the accumulation of capital, (for it has been justly observed, that he who draws a codfish from the sea, gives a piece of silver to his country,) the effect upon the trade and custom of Great Britain, and the corresponding advantages to the United States, of which the enlargement of such an intercourse was susceptible, (for the stock of fish appears inexhaustible,) you are much better able to conceive than I to describe: but I with pleasure paint them anew for your consideration, as on many accounts presenting one of the most interesting public objects to which it can be directed. Lucrative, however, and imposing in its individual and national bearings, as this fishery was, and was to become, it was little known to the leading men of our country, and little spoken of by others, even in Massachusetts, or among those who were actually engaged in it, and a knowledge of its existence in any thing like its real extent, or future capability, was perhaps confined to not more than half a dozen heads, (if so many,) in the whole of the Southern and Western, and even middle divisions of the Union.

"The causes of its value and importance not being a matter of great notoriety here, are obvious: it was an employ-

ment, not only in the fishery, but in many instances undoubtedly in *trade* with the British inhabitants; those who were engaged in it made no unnecessary promulgations of their employment, while the poorer inhabitants of the provinces, tasting equally its sweets and advantages, were alike disposed to keep silence with regard to it. But not so situated the provincial governments and the more wealthy of the merchants of the sea-port towns. They had become highly alarmed at the expansion of this fishery and trade; jealous of its progress, and clamorous at its endurance; they, therefore, of late years, have repeatedly memorialized the government in England respecting the fisheries carried on by the Americans; while the whole body of the Scottish adventurers, whose trade, both in imports and exports, and control over the inhabitants it curtailed, have turned out in the full cry and joined the chorus of the colonial governments in a crusade against the encroachments of the infidels, the disbelievers in the divine authority of kings or the rights of the provinces, and have pursued their objects so assiduously that, at their own expense, as I am informed from a respectable source, in the year 1807 or 8, they stationed a watchman in some favorable position near the Straits of Canso, to count the number of American vessels which passed those Straits on this employment; who returned nine hundred and thirty-eight as the number actually ascertained by *him* to have passed, and doubtless many others during the night or in stormy or thick weather, escaped his observation; and some of these addressers have distinctly looked forward with gratification to a state of war as a desirable occurrence, which would by its existence annul existing treaty stipulations, so injurious, as they contend, to their interests and those of the nation. With what degree of correctness this expectation has been entertained, the future must determine; but unfortunately, these murmurs and complaints reached England, and were industriously circulated about the time that our restrictive measures awakened an unusual and critical attention to the commercial connexion between the two countries, and probably the value and importance of this branch of it is now at least as fully understood and appreciated on the eastern as on the western side of the Atlantic.

"Carried away by first impressions, a large part of mankind become not unfrequently the dupes of misconception, and adhere to their opinions with a pertinacity proportioned to the time they have entertained them. From a source something like this, it has been, and is generally, I might almost say universally, believed by the mass of our countrymen, that the right of fishing on the banks o Newfoundland, or as it is properly called, the Grand Bank, was the great boon acquired, as it respected the fisheries, by the treaty of 1783, while unquestionably the fisheries on the banks of Newfoundland no more belonged exclusively, in possession or the right of control, either to Great Britain or to the United States, than the air of Heaven is the patent property of both or either of them, with power to dole out its use to such other nations as agree to conform to the stipulations they may please to prescribe for its enjoyment. If any thing was gained or secured on this head, it undoubtedly was the *Coast Fisheries*, on the shores of the British provinces. This is the fishery which will now come under discussion, at least, if not into contest, between the two countries. It is highly important that correct ideas of its value and extent should be entertained, and perhaps these could not be more perspicuously traced than by taking a relative view of it, compared with the importance of the *Bank Fishery*. This I will now briefly attempt; confident, that if in doing it I should be reiterating to you the communication of facts of a knowledge of which you are already acquainted, the motive will bring along with it its own sufficient apology.

"The *Bank Fishery* is carried on in vessels generally from 70 to 90 tons burthen, and manned with eight or ten men each. They commence their voyages early in March, and continue in this employment until the last of October, in which time they make *two*, and sometimes three fares to the United States, bringing their fish home to be cured. The produce of these trips, if successful, after paying the shoresmen the expense of making or curing, generally furnishes a sufficient quantity of dried fish to load the vessel for Europe. These vessels employed in fishing require cables of from 160 to 180 fathoms in length. They must always keep their sails bent to the yards, so as to be ready, in case of accident to the cable, or any of those adverse occurrences to which tempests or the casualties incident to anchoring nearly in mid ocean, must expose them. They purchase salted clams for bait, which they procure at considerable expense, and

take with them from the United States. They fish night and day, when the fish bite well, which is not always the case, and haul their cod in a depth of water from 45 to 55 fathoms. After catching, they head and open the fish, and place them in the hold, in an uncured, and consequently, in some degree, in a partially perishing state; and after having obtained a fare, or freight, return with it to the United States, to be cured or dried and prepared for exportation; but before this is done, or they can be landed, the fish is always more or less deteriorated, becomes softer, and part of it makes an inferior quality of fish, called Jamaica fish, and the proportion of this Jamaica fish is much greater than it would have been had the fish been dried and cured shortly after having been taken, as is the case with the coast and bay fishery; in addition to which, these vessels employed in the bank fishery are unavoidably obliged to prosecute this business with a great comparative expense, as to the wear and tear of their vessels, and loss of time, and with an increased degree of hazard, both as to safety and success.

"The *Coast and Labrador Fisheries* are prosecuted in vessels of from 40 to 120 tons burthen, carrying a number of men, according to their respective sizes, in about the same proportion as the vessels on the bank fishery. They commence their voyages in May, and get on the fishing ground about the 1st of June, before which time bait cannot be obtained. This bait is furnished by a small species of fish called *capling*, which strike in shore at that time, and are followed by immense shoals of codfish, which feed upon them. Each vessel selects its own fishing ground along the coasts of the bay of Chaleurs, the gulph of St. Lawrence, the straits of Bellisle, the coast of Labrador, even as far as Cumberland Island, and the entrance of Hudson's Bay, thus improving a fishing ground reaching in extent from the 45th to the 68th degree of north latitude.

"In choosing their situation, the fishermen generally seek some sheltered and safe harbor, or cove, where they anchor in about *six* or *seven fathom* water, unbend their sails, stow them below, and literally making themselves at home, dismantle and convert their vessels into habitations, at least as durable as those of the ancient Scythians. They then cast a net over the stern of the vessel, in which a sufficient number of capling are soon caught to supply them with bait from day to day. Each vessel is furnished with four or five light boats, according to their size and number of men, each boat requiring two men. They leave the vessel early in the morning, and seek the best or sufficiently good spot for fishing, which is frequently found within a few rods of their vessels, and very rarely more than one or two miles distant from them, where they haul the fish as fast as they can pull their lines, and sometimes, it is said, that the fish have been so abundant, as to be gafted or scooped into the boats, without even a hook or line, and the fishermen also say, that the codfish have been known to pursue the capling in such quantities, and with such voracity, as to run in large numbers quite out of water on to the shores. The boats return to the vessels about nine o'clock in the morning, at breakfast, put their fish on board, salt and split them; and after having fished several days, by which time the salt has been sufficiently struck in the fish first caught, they carry them on shore, and spread and dry them on the rocks or temporary flakes. This routine is followed every day, with the addition of attending to such as have been spread, and carrying on board and stowing away those that have become sufficiently cured, until the vessel is filled with dried fish fit for an immediate market, which is generally the case by the *middle* or *last of August*, and with which she then proceeds immediately to Europe, or returns to the United States; and this fish, thus caught and cured, is esteemed the best that is brought to market, and for several years previous to that of 1808, was computed to furnish *three fourth parts* of all the dried fish exported from the United States. This fishery was also about that time taking a new form, which would have had a double advantage, both in point of profit and extension; for some of our merchants were beginning to send their large vessels to the Labrador coast, and its vicinity, to receive *there*, from small fishing boats they employed or purchashed from, cured fish, to load their vessels with immediately for Europe; thus saving so great an expense in getting the fish to market abroad, as would in a short time have given our merchants a command of the European markets, and would have also afforded an encouragement to a small but very numerous boat fishery, which, from receiving the pay for their labor on the spot, could not fail to have been greatly excited and in

creased, and enabling the persons concerned in the exportation from the coast, to receive at home the proceeds of their adventures from abroad, about as early as the *bank fish* could have been put into a state fit to be exported from the United States; in addition to which, we were prosecuting a very productive salmon and mackerel fishery, in the same vicinity, as most of the pickled fish we had received for some years prior to the war were caught on those shores.

"This *Coast Fishery*, then, most highly important and invaluable as I think it must be admitted to be, even from the foregoing hasty imperfect sketch of it, merits every possible degree of attention and effort for its preservation on the part of the government of the United States. The refusal of the British Commissioners to renew, or recognise the stipulation of the treaty of 1783, respecting it, and the notification, I hope not formally given, that it would not hereafter be permitted without an equivalent, are alarming indications in reference to the future peaceable prosecution of this fishery, and of the dispositions of the British government with regard to it.

"The difference of expression used in the third article of the treaty of peace of 1783, as to the *right* of fishing on the Banks of Newfoundland and the *liberty* of fishing on the coasts of the British provinces in North America, however it might have originated, affords a diversity of expression which, in the present instance, will be seized, and be made to give the partisans of Great Britain and of the provinces a popular color of justice in support of their arguments, when they contend, as I think they probably will do, that in so important a compact, the variance of language could not have been a matter of accident: that if precision in the use of terms in their most literal sense is any where to be expected, it is certainly to be looked for in an instrument, which is to form the paramount law between two nations, whose clashing interests have brought them into collision, and which is generally framed by men of the most distinguished talents of each party, the acuteness of whose conceptions is always kept in full play, by the contending pretensions they have respectively to consult and sustain; and that therefore a distinction was made, and was intended to be made, at the time of the negotiation between a right derived from the God of nature, and to be exercised on the common field of his bounty, the great highway of nations; and the *liberty*, permission, or indulgence, as they will term it, to continue the exercise of an employment on the coast at the very doors, and within the peculiar and especial jurisdiction, of another nation: the one according to this doctrine being a right inherent and not to be drawn in question; the other a sufferance open to modification or denial, altogether subsequently to a war, according to the will or the interests of the party originally acceding to it.

"The *liberty*, for the expression of the treaty in the discussion between the two nations must be admitted, whether it operate adversely or favorably to us, rests for its own continuance, either as we assert, on the ground of right as an anterior possession and a perpetual franchise, or as the British will contend, on the existence of the treaty of 1783. The first ground to be supported on the view taken of it in your own letter, and in that which you had the goodness to communicate to me, and even on the second, admitting *pro forma*, that a declaration of war does, *ipso facto*, abrogate all previous treaty stipulations, brought into contest by it, unless tacitly or expressly renewed by a new treaty, to be an acknowledged principle of international law, still the right in question, could, I believe, rest untouched and unaffected, although I know not with what degree of decision or determination the negotiation of a future use of the coast fisheries was brought forward in the negotiations at Ghent, by the British Commissioners. But while on the one hand the coupling the offer to treat for a renewal of the liberty of the coast fisheries, for an equivalent with a proposition to treat for a renewal of the right of the free navigation of the Mississippi, also for an equivalent, unless, as has been suspected, they were made with the insidious purpose of obtaining an admission that both had already ceased to exist, shows the confidence they would wish to appear to entertain in the soundness of their position, that the war had extinguished both the right and the liberty; for the former, the free navigation of the Mississippi, if force of language and repetition are to have any weight, could not well have been placed on a stronger basis, it being very expressly and explicitly contracted for in the treaty of 1783, recognised in that of 1794, and again mentioned in a provisional article in 1796, still, on the other hand, the omission in the new treaty to state that the treaty of 1783 had expired or been annulled, and a reference having

been made to it in several instances, is a yet stronger evidence that they *did* consider that treaty as remaining in existence, and of consequence, entitled to respect and observance in all such of its provisions as had not been specially contravened in the new treaty.

"A liberty was recognised by the treaty of 1783, for the inhabitants of the United States, to prosecute the fisheries on the coasts of British North America, with the exception of the Island of Newfoundland, not only where the parties had been accustomed to use them, but where British fishermen not only *did*, but might thereafter, (that is, subsequently to the date of the treaty) prosecute them, and this *right*, for it had now become a *right of liberty or use*, demanded by the one party and admitted and acknowledged by the other, was wholly without limits as to its duration, and could then only cease, or the limitation take effect, on the happening of one of three events, that is, the surrender of the party possessing the right and the annulment of the treaty which confirmed it, or by an usurped and unjustifiable exercise of power on the one part, in defiance of the rights of the other, and in violation of those common principles of good faith, which can alone regulate the intercourse between nations; but the surrender of the right has not been made by the United States, and the treaty of 1783 has not been annihilated by the existence of the war, because the parties have not only not agreed to abrogate it, but have expressly referred to it, and in the treaty of Ghent, made a provision to carry the stipulations as to boundaries of the treaty of 1783, more fully and completely into effect: now it being an uncontroverted principle of the law of evidence, that the whole must be admitted if a part is received, unless some reciprocal and mutual agreement exists to the contrary, and as no such stipulation does exist in the present case, the treaty of 1783, is, as I should contend, even by the showing of the British Commissioners themselves, still in existence with all the rights and liberties incident to it, with the full and free use to the inhabitants of the United States, of the fisheries, as firmly recognised and secured to the United States, by that treaty.

"This is the construction, whether to be supported on this ground or any other, which I hope the government of our country will maintain. It is a right most highly important to the eastern section, and, indeed, to the present and future naval and commercial powers of the U. States: and should the British ministry or Colonial authorities attempt to interdict this fishery, as I think they now will, to the inhabitants of the United States, the government ought, and I trust will, take most prompt and efficient measures to obtain and enforce a renewal or recognition of this right as it has heretofore existed. It is a gem which should never be surrendered, nor can it ever be abandoned by any statesman, alive to the interests of his country: compared in its consequences with a free right of navigating the Mississippi, it is even a much more unequal stake than would be "six French rapiers imponed against six Barbary horses."

"The right of navigating the Mississippi, since the acquisition of Louisiana, and the possession of both sides of the river by the United States, and when the difficulties of the ascending navigation are considered, and the jealousy and inconvenience which the subjects of Great Britain must experience from attempting to avail of it, can be of little value to her, except as in its higher branches, and on the Missouri, it may facilitate the prosecution of the fur trade. This trade, however, although it employs a large number of persons, never has been very important to the nation, and must, from the operation of individual causes, gradually lessen, and in the course of a few years, recede altogether from the great rivers. She has, therefore, notwithstanding the opinion of two of the American Commissioners, and her own, probable pretensions of fairness, given up nothing in point of value, compared with the fisheries, which upon the same ground, she is undoubtedly desirous of fortifying herself in withholding.

"In compliance with the intimation you had given me, I have commented on this subject at much greater length, even than I had contemplated at the outset, perhaps too minutely, when I recollect that a part of it at least, must be much better understood at Quincy, than by myself, but the account of the recent state of these fisheries and the mode in which they were prosecuted, I thought might not be unacceptable to you. My information in regard to them, has in general been derived from respectable sources, upon which I can rely, never having had any direct interest or concern in the fisheries myself. I have not attempted to apply the principle of public law to the question respecting them, because the few books of this description, which I possess, are still at

Washington; and since the rising of the Council, I have not had time to make any research elsewhere, and because I presume this part of the business will be placed under the hands of those who will have both the means and the ability to do it ample justice.

"I had intended also in reference to the treaty of 1814, to have made some few remarks on the interdiction it may occasion, of a trade between the United States and the British ports in India, and on its operation upon the contested boundary on our North Eastern frontier, as regards the right of possession to the Islands of Dudley, Moore, and Frederick, in the bay of Passamaquoddy. I have, however, already so unduly trespassed on your patience, that I will only not omit them altogether. Both these subjects attach to them some importance, but compared in point of value, with the possession of the fisheries, perhaps in a ratio not much greater than the bullion in the mint at Philadelphia, would be to the ore in the mines of Peru.

"Feeling persuaded that in avowing the hope that all these objects may be disposed of in such a manner as best to confirm the rights and secure the interests of the United States, I shall unite fully in sentiment with yourself.

"I have the honor to remain, sir, with great consideration, your very respectful and obedient servant."

(Signed) JAMES LLOYD.

Copy of a Letter from James Lloyd to John Quincy Adams, deposited in the Department of State.

SIR: In a former note, returning *the letter with which you had obligingly favored me*, I had the honor to offer you my congratulations on the termination of the war, without waiting to know what were the grounds of the treaty which concluded it; because, from the tenor of the previous correspondence, and my personal knowledge of nearly all the commissioners, I felt a reliance that the arrangement would not be dishonorable, though I acknowledge my rejoicing was mingled with fear, lest it should be, at least in some points, a disadvantageous one; and this expression of feeling I volunteered with the more readiness, as the intelligence was received at a moment when the national character had been splendidly illustrated by the recent achievement at New Orleans.

I greeted the occurrence with smiles principally, not because I expected it would bring or restore to us all the benefits we possessed under former treaties, but because I saw no chance, but from this source, of happier prospects for the future. It was not, however, the storm that howled along the lakes, or upon the sea-board, that created the apprehension of an instant for the fate of the contest, but it was the hidden fire that was rumbling within our own bosoms, and which, under a continuance of the war, would, I believe, have made our country the theatre of domestic convulsions, as well as of foreign warfare, and perhaps, from its effects, have offered up some parts of it, as no very difficult prey, to the mercy of the enemy.

On this head I know, sir, you had better hopes, and thought differently from me; and I have now only to say, I am glad the experiment has never come to issue.

As the price of the purchase of an escape from evils portentous as these, I considered it as probable that the English government might claim from us the contested eastern islands, and interdict all trade between us and her colonial possessions; and possibly still further, that she would endeavor to extort from us the coast fisheries around her own shores, for, on the magnanimity or friendship of Great Britain, or of any other nation, in matters of interest, I confess I never had the ability to lash my imagination into any sort of dependence; but I did also cherish the belief, that none of our essential or important rights or *liberties* would be diminished or surrendered. Of the latter, the one of the greatest consequence in reference to its intrinsic value, and as derived from *discovery and possession* confirmed by a formal treaty stipulation, is unquestionably that to which you have referred—the coast fisheries on the shores of the British possessions in North America.

These fisheries, as most advantageously secured to the United States by the treaty of 1783, and made at the time, as I have always understood, a *sine qua non* of that treaty, principally by *one* of our then ministers, offer an invaluable fund of wealth and power to our country, one which has never been duly attended to, nor justly appreciated, but which, if continued *or* improved, was *destined to grow with our growth, and strengthen with our strength;* and, at no very distant day, to extract the cream of the trade, as well

as the fisheries, and render, in a great measure, dependant upon, if *not tributary* to us, all the British Atlantic possessions upon this continent.

In reviewing the recognition of this *liberty* for the inhabitants of the United States, to fish, without limitation of time, on all the coasts of Newfoundland, which *British* fishermen *shall* use, and, also, on all the coasts, bays, and creeks, of *all other* his Britannic majesty's dominions in America, and with the exception of the island of Newfoundland, to dry and cure fish on the said shores, wherever unsettled, or where settled, with the approbation of the proprietors or possessors of the soil, it is difficult to suppress a homage of respect for the *talents and prescience of the negotiators* on the one side, in obtaining the recognition of such a right or liberty, or of surprise at the *heedlessness* or *obtuseness* of those on the other in acceding to it, *except under the pressure of some necessity.*

This liberty is, in fact, looking to it in its naked state, and such in time of general peace it would shortly have proved itself to be, granting to a young and increasing, a powerful and rival nation, the ability to moor within a cable's length of the shore, a cordon of foreign vessels around the seaboard of the British provinces, of *engrossing the better part of all the wealth they possessed, and setting at defiance the revenue laws, both of the mother country and the colonies.* For that vastly the larger part of the fisheries, as well as the more valuable of the supplies of these provinces, would have found their way through this line of circumvallation, was as certain to happen, as the regular appearance of the American fishermen on their coasts.

The prosecution of these coast and bay fisheries, although it had already become extremely advantageous, has undoubtedly reached, in a very small degree, the extension and importance it was capable of attaining. The unsettled state of the commercial world for the past twenty years, and the more alluring objects of commercial enterprise which such a state of things developed, served, in point of immediate consideration and attention, to throw these fisheries into the back ground; but still, until first checked by the system of embargoes and restrictions, and finally stopped by a declaration of war, they were silently but rapidly progressing and reaching an importance which, although generally *unknown* to our country and its statesmen, has become highly alarming to the governments and more wealthy merchants of the provinces, and was beginning to attract the attention and jealousy of the cabinet of Great Britain towards them.

The shores, the creeks, the inlets of the Bay of Fundy, the Bay of Chaleur the Gulph of St. Lawrence, the Straits of Bellisle, and the Coast of Labrador, appear to have been designed by the God of nature as the great ovarium of fish, the inexhaustible repository of this species of food, not only for the supply of the American but of the European continent. At the proper season to catch them in endless abundance, little more of effort is needed than to bait the hook and pull the line, and, occasionally, this is not necessary. *In clear weather, near the shores, myriads are visible, and the strand is at times almost literally paved with them.*

All this was gradually making itself known to the enterprise and vigilance of the New England fishermen; and for a few seasons prior to the year 1808, the resort to this employment had become an object of attention from the Thames, at New London, to the Schoodic; and boats and vessels of a small as well as of a large size, were flocking to it from all the intermediate ports of the United States. In the fishing season, at the best places for catching the cod, the New England fishermen, *I am told*, on a Sunday, swarmed like flies upon the shores; and that, in some of these years, it *probably* would not be an over estimate, to rate the vessels employed in this fishery, belonging to the United States, at from fifteen hundred to two thousand sail, *reckoning a vessel for each trip or voyage;* and this number, if the fisheries were continued, would shortly be still further and very greatly extended.

The nursery for seamen; the consequent increase of power; the mine of wealth; the accumulation of capital, (for it has been justly observed, that he who draws a cod-fish from the sea, gives a piece of silver to his country;) *the control over the British North American provinces; the effect upon the trade and customs* of the parent country, and the corresponding advantages to the United States, (of which the enlargement of such an intercourse was susceptible,) you are much better able to conceive than I am to describe, but I with pleasure point them anew to your consideration, as, on many accounts, presenting one of the most interesting public objects to which it can be devoted.

Lucrative, however, and imposing in its individual and national bearings, as this fishery was, and was to become, *it was little known to the leading men of our country, and little spoken of by others even in Massachusetts*, or among those who were actually engaged in it, and a knowledge of its existence in any thing like its real extent or future capability, was perhaps confined to not more *than a dozen heads*, (if so many) in the whole of the southern and western, and even middle divisions of the Union.

The causes of its value and importance, not being a matter of greater notoriety here, are obvious. It was an employment not only in the fishery, but in many instances undoubtedly in *trade, and in an illicit trade* with the British inhabitants, in which, independently of the dread of competition, one of the inherent attributes of commerce, publicity was most carefully to be avoided. Those, therefore, who were engaged in it made no unnecessary promulgation of their employment, while their co-adjutors, the poorer inhabitants of the provinces, tasting equally its sweets and advantages, were alike disposed to keep silence with regard to it. But so situated were not the Provincial government, and the more wealthy of the merchants of the sea-port towns. They had become highly alarmed at the expansion of this fishery and trade, jealous of its progress, and clamorous at its endurance. The former saw their own consequence abridged—*their revenue intercepted*—their people alienated, envying the privileges and advantages of a neighboring nation, which their own system would not permit them to enjoy, and witnessing their famous navigation act, the sheet anchor of their commercial supremacy, rendered in its local operation at least a dead letter. They, therefore, of late years, have repeatedly memorialized the government in England respecting fisheries carried on by the Americans, while the whole body of Scottish adventurers, whose trade, both in imports and exports, and control over the inhabitants it curtailed, have turned out in full cry, and joined the chorus of the colonial governments in a crusade against the encroachments of the infidels, the disbelievers in the divine authority of kings, or the rights of the provinces—and have pursued their object so assiduously that at their own expense, as I am informed from a respectable source, in the year 1807 or 1808, they stationed a watchman in some favorable position near the straits of Canso, to count the number of the American vessels which passed those straits in this employment, who returned *nine hundred and thirty-eight*, as the number actually ascertained by him to have passed, and doubtless many others during the night, or in stormy or thick weather, escaped his observation—and some of these addressers have distinctly looked forward with gratification to a state of war, as a desirable occurrence, which would by its existence *annul existing treaty stipulations*, so injurious as they contend to their interests and those of the nation—with what degree of correctness this expectation has been entertained the future must determine. But unfortunately these murmurs, and complaints reached England, and were industriously circulated about the time that our restrictive measures, inefficacious at best, and rendered still more so from never having been fully executed, awakened an unusual and critical attention to the commercial connexion between the two countries, and probably the value and importance of this branch of it, is now at least as fully understood and appreciated on the eastern as on the western side of the Atlantic.

Carried away by first impressions, a large part of mankind become not unfrequently the dupes of misconception, and adhere to their opinions with a pertinacity proportioned to the time they have entertained them. From a source something like this, it has been, and is generally, I might almost say universally believed, by the mass of our countrymen, that the right of fishing on the banks of Newfoundland, or, as it is properly called the *Grand-bank*, was the great boon acquired as it respected the fisheries, by the treaty of 1783; while unquestionably the fisheries of the banks of Newfoundland, no more belonged exclusively in possession or the right of control, either to Great Britain or the United States, than the air of Heaven is the patent property of both or either of them, with the power to dole out its use to such other nations as may agree and conform to the stipulations they may please to prescribe for its enjoyment. If any thing was gained or secured on this head, it undoubtedly was the *coast fisheries* on the shores of the British provinces. This is the fishery that will now come under discussion, at least, if not into contest between the two countries. It is highly important that correct ideas of its value and extent should be entertained, and perhaps these

could not be more conspicuously traced than by taking a relative view of it, compared with the mode of prosecuting, and the importance of the *bank fishery*. This I will now briefly attempt, confident if in doing it I should be reiterating to you the communication of facts, of a knowledge of which you are already in possession, the motive will bring along with it its own sufficient apology.

The *bank fishery* is carried on in vessels generally of seventy to ninety tons burthen, and manned with eight or ten men each. They commence their voyages *early in March*, and continue in this employment until the last of October, in which time they make *two, and sometimes three fares* to the United States, bringing their fish home to be cured. The produce of these trips, if successful, after paying the shoresmen the expense of making or curing, generally furnishes a *sufficient quantity of dried fish* to load the vessel for Europe. These vessels employed in fishing, require cables of from one hundred and sixty to one hundred and eighty fathoms in length. They must always keep their sails bent to the yard, so as to be ready, in case of accident to the cable, or any of those adverse occurrences, to which tempests or casualties incident to anchoring nearly in mid-ocean must expose them. They purchase salted clams for bait, which they procure at considerable expense and take with them from the United States. They fish night and day when the fish bite well, which is not always the case, and haul their cod in a depth of water from forty-five to fifty-five fathoms. After catching, they head and open the fish, and place them in the hold in an uncured, and consequently in some degree in a partially perishing state, and after having obtained a fare or freight, return with it to the United States to be cured or dried, and prepared for exportation—but before this is done or they can be landed, the fish is always more or less deteriorated, becomes softer and part of it makes an inferior quality of fish, called Jamaica fish, *which is generally one-third less in price than what is considered as merchantable fish*—and the proportion of this Jamaica fish, is much greater than it would have been, had the fish been dried and cured shortly after having been taken, as is the case with the coast and bay fishery; in addition to which, these vessels employed in the bank fishery are unavoidably obliged to prosecute their business with great comparative expense, as to the wear and tear of the vessels, and loss of time and with an increased degree of hazard both as to safety and success.

The *Coast and Labrador fisheries* are prosecuted in vessels of from forty to a hundred and twenty tons burthen, carrying a number of men, according to their respective sizes, in about the same proportion as the vessels of the bank fishery; *they commence their voyages in May*, and get on the fishing ground about the *1st of June*, before which time *bait* cannot be obtained. This bait is furnished by a small species of fish called *capling*, which strike in shore at that time, and are followed by immense shoals of codfish, which feed upon them. Each vessel selects its own fishing ground along the coasts of the bay of Chaleur, Gulph of St. Lawrence; the straits of Belleisle; the coast of Labrador, and even as far as Cumberland Island and the entrance of Hudson's bay; thus improving a fishing ground, reaching in extent from the 45th to the 68th degree of north latitude. In choosing their situation, the fishermen generally seek some sheltered and safe harbor or cave, where they anchor in about *six or seven fathoms* water, unbend their sails, stow them below and literally making themselves at home, dismantle and convert their vessels into habitations at least as durable as those of the ancient Scythians, they then cast a net over the stern of the vessel, in which a sufficient number of capling are soon caught, to supply them with bait from day to day. *Each vessel* is furnished with *four or five light boats*, according to her size and number of men, each boat requiring two men: they leave the vessel early in the morning and seek the best or a sufficiently good spot for fishing, which is frequently found *within a few rods of their vessel*, and very rarely more than one or two miles distant from *it*, where they haul the fish *as fast as they can pull their lines*, and sometimes, it is said, the fish have been so abundant as *to be gafed* or scooped into the boats *without even* a hook or line; and the fishermen also say, that the codfish have been known to pursue the capling in such quantities, and with such voracity as *to run in large numbers quite out of water on the shores*. The boats return to the vessels about 9 o'clock, in the morning at breakfast—put their fish on board, and salt and split them, and after having fished several days, by which time the salt has been sufficiently *struck* in the fish first caught, *they carry them on shore*, and spread and dry them on the rocks, or temporary flakes. This

routine is followed every day, with the addition of attending to such as have been spread, and carrying on board and stowing away those that have become sufficiently cured, *until the vessel is filled with dried fish fit for an immediate market*, which is generally the case by *the middle or last of August*, and with which she then proceeds immediately to Europe, or returns to the United States; and this fish thus caught and cured, is esteemed the best that is brought to market, and for several years previous to that of 1808, was computed to furnish *three fourths* part of all the dried fish exported from the United States.

This fishery was also about that time taking a new form, which would have had a double advantage both in point of profit and extension, for some of our merchants were beginning to send their large vessels to the Labrador coast and its vicinity, to receive *there* from small fishing boats they employed or purchased from, cured fished to load their vessels with immediately for Europe, thus saving so great an expense in getting the fish to market abroad, as would in a short time have given our merchants a command o the European markets, and would also have afforded an encouragement to a small but very numerous boat fishery, which from receiving the pay for their labor on the spot, would not fail to have been very greatly excited and increased, and enabling the persons concerned in the exportation from the coast to receive at home the proceeds of their adventures from abroad about as early as the *bank-fish* could have been put into a state fit to be exported from the United States. In addition to which we were prosecuting a very productive *salmon* and mackerel fishery in the same vicinity, as most of the pickled fish of this description, we had received for some years prior to the war, were caught on those shores.

This *coast fishery*, then, most highly important and invaluable, as I think it must be admitted to be, even from the foregoing hasty and imperfect sketch of it, merits every possible degree of attention and effort for its preservation on the part of the government of the United States; the refusal of the British Commissioners to renew or to recognise the stipulation of the treaty of 1783, respecting it—*and the notification, I hope not formally given that it would not hereafter be permitted without an equivalent*, are alarming indications in reference to the future peaceable prosecution of this fishery, and the dispositions of the British government with regard to it.

The difference of expression used in the third article of the treaty of peace of 1783, as to the *right* of fishing on the banks of Newfoundland, and the *liberty* of fishing on the coasts of the British provinces in North America, however it might have originated, affords a diversity of expression, which, in the present instance, will be seized upon, and be made to give *to the partisans of Great Britain* and of the provinces, a popular color of justice in support of their argument, when they contend, as I think they probably will do, that in so important a compact this variance of language could not have been a matter of accident, that if precision in the use of terms in their most literal sense is any where to be expected, it is certainly to be looked for in an instrument which is to form the paramount law between two nations, whose clashing interests have brought them into collision, and which is generally framed by men of the most distinguished talents of each party, the acuteness of whose perception is always kept in full play by the contending pretensions they have respectively to consult and sustain, and that therefore a distinction was made, and was intended to be made at the time of the negotiation between the *right* derived from the God of nature, and to be exercised on the common field of his bounty, the great highway of nations, and the liberty, permission, or indulgence, as they will phrase it, to continue the exercise of an employment on the coasts, at *the very doors and within the peculiar and special jurisdiction of another nation*: the one, according to this doctrine, being a right inherent, and not to be drawn in question, the other a sufferance open to modification or denial altogether subsequently to a war, according to the will or the interests of the party originally acceding to it.

This *liberty*, for the expression of the treaty in the discussion between the two nations must be admitted, whether it operate adversely or favorably to us, rests for its continuance, either as we assert, on the ground of right, as an anterior possession and perpetual franchise, or, as the British will contend, on the existence of the treaty of '83: the first ground is to be supported on the view taken of it in *your own letter*, and THAT which you had *the goodness to communicate to me*; and even on the second, admitting, *pro forma*, that a declaration of war does ipso

facto abrogate all previous treaty stipulations brought in contest by it, whether *tacitly* or expressly by a new treaty, to be an acknowledged principle of international law, still the *right* in question would, I believe, rest untouched and unaffected; although I know not, with what degree of decision or determination, *the negation of a future use of the Coast fisheries was brought forward in the negotiations at Ghent by the British Commissioners.*

But while on the one hand, the coupling the offer to treat for a renewal of the coast fisheries for an equivalent, with a proposition to treat for a renewal of the right of the free navigation of the Mississippi also for an equivalent, unless as has been suspected, they were made with the insidious purpose of obtaining an admission that both had already ceased to exist, shows the confidence they would wish to appear to entertain, in the soundness of their position, that the war had extinguished both the right and the liberty; for the former, the free navigation of the Mississippi, if force of language and repetition are to have any weight, could not well have been placed on a stronger basis, it being very expressly and explicitly contracted for, in the treaty of '83, recognised in that of '94, and again mentioned in a provisional article in '96; still, on the other hand the *omission* in the new treaty, to state that the treaty of '83 had expired, or been annulled, and a reference having been made to it in several instances, is a yet stronger evidence that they *did* consider that treaty as remaining in existence, and of consequence entitled to respect and observance, in all such of its provisions as had not been specially controverted in the new treaty.

A liberty was recognised by the treaty of 1783, for the inhabitants of the United States to prosecute the fisheries on the coasts of British North America, with the exception of the Island of Newfoundland, not only where the parties had been accustomed to use them, but where British fishermen not only *did* but might thereafter (that is subsequently to the date of the treaty) prosecute them, and this *right*, for it had now become *a right of liberty or use*, demanded by the one party and admitted and acknowledged by the other, was wholly without limits as to its duration, and could then only cease, or the limitation take effect on the happening of one of three events; that is by the surrender of the person possessing the right, the annulment of the treaty which confirmed it, or by an usurped and unjustifiable exercise of power on the one part in defiance of the rights of the other, and in violation of those common principles of good faith which can alone regulate the intercourse between nations; but the surrender of this right has not been made, and will not be made by the United States; and the treaty of 1783 has not been annihilated by the existence of the war, because the parties have not only *not agreed* to abrogate it, but have expressly referred to it, and in the treaty of Ghent made a provision to carry the stipulations as to boundaries of the treaty of '83, more fully and completely into effect; now, it being *an uncontroverted principle of the law of evidence*, that the whole must be admitted, if a part is received, unless some reciprocal and mutual agreement exists to the contrary, and as no such stipulation does exist in the present case, the treaty of 1783 is, as I should contend, even by the showing of the British Commissioners themselves, still in existence, with all the rights and liberties incident to it, and of consequence with the full and free use to the inhabitants of the United States, of the fisheries as formally recognised and secured to the United States by that treaty.

This is the construction, whether it be supported on this ground or any other, which I hope the government of our country will maintain—it is a right most highly important to the eastern section, and indeed to the present and future naval and commercial powers of the United States, and should the British ministry or Colonial authorities attempt to interdict this fishery, as I think they now will, to the inhabitants of the United States, the government ought, and I trust will, take the most prompt and effectual measures to obtain and enforce a renewal or recognition of this right as it has heretofore existed. It is a gem which should never be surrendered, *nor can it ever be abandoned by any statesmen alive to the interests of their country;* compared in its consequences with a free right of navigating the Mississippi, it is even a much more unequal stake than would be "six French rapiers imposed against six Barbary horses."

The right of navigating the Mississippi since the acquisition of Louisiana and the possession of both sides of the river by the United States, and when the difficulties of the ascending navigation are considered, and the jealousy and incon-

venience which the subjects of Great Britain must experience from attempting to avail of it, can be of little value to her, except as in its higher branches and on the Missouri, it may facilitate the prosecution of the fur trade; this trade, however, although it employs a large number of persons never has been very important to the nation, and must, from the operation of unavoidable causes, gradually lessen, and in the course of a few years, probably recede altogether from the great rivers. *She has, therefore, notwithstanding the opinion of two of the American Commissioners*, and her own probable pretensions of fairness given up nothing, in point of value, compared with the fisheries, which upon the same ground she is undoubtedly desirous of fortifying herself in withholding.

In compliance with the intimation you had given me, I have commented on this subject at much greater length even than I had contemplated at the outset, perhaps too minutely, when I recollect that a part of it, at least, must be so much better understood at *Quincy* than by myself; but the account of the recent state of these fisheries and the mode in which they were prosecuted, I thought might not be unacceptable to you. My information in regard to them has, in general, been derived from respectable sources on which I can rely, *never having* had any direct interest or concern in the fisheries myself. I have not attempted to apply the principles of public law to the questions respecting them, because the few books of this description which I possess are still at Washington, and since the rising of the council I have not had time to make any research elsewhere; and because I presume this part of the business will be placed under the hands of those who will have both the means and the ability to do it ample justice.

I had intended also, in reference to the treaty of 1814, to have made some remarks on the interdiction it may occasion, of a trade between the United States and the British ports in India, and on its operation on the contested boundary on our northeastern frontier, so far as regards the right of possession, to the Island of Dudley, Moose, and Frederick, in the Bay of Passamaquoddy. I have, however, already so unduly trespassed on your patience, that I will only not omit noticing them altogether. Both these objects attach to them some importance, but compared in point of value with the possession of the fisheries, perhaps in a ratio not much greater than the bullion in the Mint at Philadelphia would bear to the ore in the mines of Peru.

If it be true, as it undoubtedly is, that in the absence of treaty stipulations every nation has a right to control or interdict altogether to others a trade with its own dominions, then this trade to British ports in India, the agreement respecting it in 1794, having expired by its own terms, is perfectly within the regulation of the government of Great Britain without any reference to our wishes, or profit, or advantage. It has gone by one omission, to renew the treaty of '94 under which it was prosecuted with benefit, and was beginning to afford a new emolument to us by our availing of the *letter* of the treaty, which allowed to trade from British India to "America," to prosecute a trade between Bengal and the Spanish and Portuguese ports in *South America*. This was a trade not contemplated at the time the treaty was made, and the liberty to engage in it is not possessed by the English East India Company under its charter; but had Mr. Jay's treaty been continued or renewed, I know not how the British government or the Company could have got clear of the construction which permitted it to vessels of the United States.

The direct trade to our own ports was advantageous to us, although principally carried on with specie, inasmuch as it gave employment to our large ships, to the most respectable of our navigators and the best of our seamen; as it consumed and took off considerable quantities of our provisions, and besides supplying us with cheap fabrics for domestic use, furnished us also with many important articles of export, which in small parcels, but in the aggregate, to an important amount, eventually found their way to South America, the West Indies, Mediterranean and the North of Europe, we were also gradually feeling our way and becoming possessed of a knowledge of some articles of export from hence, which the loftiness or laziness of the Company's servants had overlooked, and although specie formed the principal part of the capital of these voyages, popular opinion to the contrary notwithstanding; this circumstance to my view offered little or no objection to it, for I have no belief that such a trade in specie can be injurious to a country until the drain of it becomes so excessive, as materially to advance the price of the precious metals in

consequence of the abduction of them; and when this is the case, the disease will bring its own remedy; the trade will immediately stop of itself, because the profits on it have not been so large as to allow of its prosecution at any great additional expense.

But as this trade to the British ports in India, furnished revenue to the English government, money and animation to the native manufacturers, as we generally received goods of a less valuable fabric than those prepared for the India Company; and as even in the opinion of some of the Governors General, I believe Lord Mornington and Lord Cornwallis, the trade was profitable to the English as well as ourselves, it is not improbable after the fit of ill humor may have passed away that it will again return to us, from a sense of their own advantage in renewing it. Without discovering trop d'empressment for its attainment, any opening for securing it on a treaty basis should be embraced, as nearly on the terms of the treaty of '94 as may be practicable, for the voyage is both too distant and expensive to be undertaken upon occasional licenses, or to depend upon the will or caprice of the local authorities in India.

The contested Islands in the Bay of Passamaquoddy are valuable to us, as now possessing a population of from 2000 to 2500 persons, and as affording greater facilities than the main in prosecuting the trade in Gypsum, or Plaster of Paris; of which there were received from thence in some years, in vessels of the United States, about 3,000 tons, being three quarters of the whole quantity taken from the Bay of Fundy, where it is principally found. The Islands are also valuable, from enabling us the better to carry on a boat fishing, principally in *Pollock*, a fish well adapted to the West India market, and which are caught in great quantities in the currents near those Islands. But the points of this subject must be now well understood, as they have been under consideration in the papers, and between the States and General Government, and the British Government and the Provinces, nearly since the peace of 1783, for the discussion of them began, I believe, with Governor Hancock, in 1786, and has been continued under every administration of the General Government until the present.

When at Washington I had made this subject a topic of inquiry, supposing it might come within the scope of my efficient duty to attend to it, but I will not dilate on it. It is a question of right not to be governed by the received principle of national law, where rivers form boundaries, but by the fair construction of the article which refers to it in the treaty of 1783, and lies, I think, in a nutshell.

If the ancient charter of Nova Scotia granted in 1621, the jurisdiction exercised antecedently to the commencement of the Revolutionary war, and the old maps of the Province can be brought in evidence, in support of the British claim, the question is, I think, decided at once. If these things cannot be done, the Islands belong to us.

The English view of the subject has been more distinctly stated in a work of Nathaniel Atcheson, printed at London, in 1808, than in any other publication I have seen.

Feeling persuaded that in avowing the hope that all these objects may be disposed of in such manner as best to confirm the rights, and secure the interests of the United States, I shall unite fully in sentiment with yourself.

I have the honor to remain, sir, with great consideration, your very respectful and obedient servant.

(Signed) JAMES LLOYD.

His Excellency JOHN ADAMS.

BOSTON, *March 8th*, 1815.

Copy of a letter from Mr. Russell to Mr Crawford.

GHENT, *4th November*, 1814.

MY DEAR SIR: Since I had the pleasure of writing you on the 25th ult. I have received your letter of the 24th of that month. I most heartily rejoice with you on the late successes on the other side of the Atlantic, and in the apparent improvement of the public spirit there to regret, however, still to see that Boston federalism persists in separating the country from the government, and in acting as citizens of Massachusetts, rather than as citizens of the United States.

You will perceive, by the last note which we have received from the British Plenipotentiaries, a copy of which I now send you by Doctor Boswell, that the same spirit of procrastination and equivocation still prevails in the British cabinet. It is, indeed, astonishing, that any thing which has yet been presented to us, should be considered as a complete project of a pacification. We are, indeed, somewhat at a loss, after the obscurity which appears designedly to have been thrown over this subject, to decide what pretensions, originally brought forward

by the adverse party, have been abandoned, and what are still persisted in. Whether, for instance, we are to hear any thing more about Indian barrier, the exclusive British military possession of the lakes, the uti possidetis, &c. We have decided, however, in order to prevent further quibbling, though not without reluctance by some of us, to furnish a complete project of our own. If we adhere to the understanding which we now have, we shall make the *status ante bellum* a *sine qua non*.

The question which perplexes us the most, is that concerning the fisheries, and we have not yet decided on the mode of proceeding in relation to it. They have told us that the liberty of taking, drying, and curing our fish, within the exclusive jurisdiction of Great Britain, will not be continued to us without an equivalent. We cannot relinquish the liberty, and we cannot offer territory as an equivalent. Shall we, then, offer the free navigation of the Mississippi, which they apparently suggested, with this view? I think this will be carried in the affirmative, although I confess I have very serious objections to the measure.

We are without any precise information as to the doings at Vienna, and can form no satisfactory opinion as to the result. Has France the firmness to persist in a course of resistance to the pretensions of her late conquerors; and has the present king a real disposition to do so? It is a little extraordinary, if she has any intention of proceeding to extremities with England, that she has not taken measures to ascertain, either through you or through us, how far she may presume on the continuance of the American war as a diversion in her favor. I am afraid that all her remonstrances will amount to nothing. &c. &c.

JONATHAN RUSSELL.

His Excellency Wm. H. Crawford.

Copy of a letter from Mr. Crawford, to Mr. Russell, dated,

Paris, *November 10th*, 1814.

My Dear Sir: Yours of the 4th instant, was delivered on the 8th, in the evening. I regret that there is a probability of your having offered the free navigation of the Mississippi as an equivalent for taking and drying fish within the jurisdiction of the enemy. This privilege, as enjoyed before the war, was diminishing from year to year. The privilege of drying fish on shore, as well as I recollect, was confined to the coasts which were unsettled or uninhabited. As these settlements extended, the privilege diminished, and there is but very little reason to doubt, but that they would have been extended with an express view to that diminution. Why do they want the privilege of navigating the Mississippi? Ostensibly to communicate with their possessions in the North by means of this river; really to smuggle their manufactures into the country, and to extend their connexions with, and influence over the Indians, and, through their agency, to increase their means of annoying us. There can be no mistake or illiberality in this opinion. Coleman, Editor of the New York Evening Post, asserts, that two-thirds of the fish caught by the United States, are sent home to be salted and cured, and that the other third might as well be. If no other equivalent can be found but that of the free navigation of the Mississippi, I hope none will be offered.

The privilege is not of such importance as to justify a concession which will permit the enemy, duty free, to smuggle his manufactures from the north of the Mississippi to the Lakes, and will place in his hands the means of setting upon our frontier settlements all the savage tribes of North America. The privilege of drying fish within the jurisdiction of the enemy, when confined to their uninhabited shores, will continue to diminish, as I have already stated, but the equivalent which we grant, will continue to increase in value from year to year. This is a consideration which ought to have great weight. Anderson, a member of Parliament, in a book written with the ostensible view of proving the importance of Canada, has insisted upon the necessity of prosecuting the war until they conquer Louisiana. The strong inducement, which he holds out to the government, is the facility which it will give them of forcing their manufactures into the United States in spite of the government.

This book is dedicated to Mr. Rose. The free navigation of the Mississippi places in their hands this facility, which, in the opinion of the writer, is an object of such importance as to justify the continuance of the war.

Present my respects to your colleagues, and accept for yourself the assurance of my high regard.

(Signed) WM. H. CRAWFORD.

His Excellency Jonathan Russell.

P. S. The idea that France will press any point at Vienna at the risk of war

with England, is wholly inadmissible. So far from taking this ground is she, that I am persuaded that this government looks to England for support in case of difficulty and trouble at home. Lord Wellington has the use of the Telegraph to correspond with the English army in Belgium. The neutrality of France between the United States and England, will depend entirely upon the importance which the latter attaches to it. I am persuaded that nothing but actual hostilities will induce France to make war upon England.

W. H. C.

Copy of a letter from Mr. Russell to Mr. Crawford, dated.

Ghent, 24*th Nov.* 1814.

My Dear Sir: Your favor of the 10th inst. together with its duplicate, reached me in due time.

Without having been deceived relative to the disposition of the majority on the subject of the free navigation of the Mississippi, I am happy to inform you that this disposition was not inflexible, and we finally transmitted our project without the article that had at first been carried. This article was as follows:

"The right and liberty of the people and inhabitants of the United States to take, dry, and cure fish, in places within the exclusive jurisdiction of Great Britain, as recognised (and secured) by the former treaty of peace, and the privilege of the navigation of the Mississippi within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, (as secured to the subjects of Great Britain by the same treaty) are here recognised and confirmed."

Besides the objections to such an article, which had occurred to you, and which had not escaped us, the blending the two points together, and making them mutually dependant on each other, which was not done in the treaty of 1783, made this article the more exceptionable.

The project which we finally presented, consists of fifteen articles, in substance as follows:

First. Peace, and the mutual restoration of all territory, places, possessions, and all archives, records, deeds, and papers, either public or private, taken by either party during the war; no destruction or carrying away of any artillery, or other public property, or slaves, or other private property, to be permitted.

Second. All vessels and effects taken after certain periods (left blank) in different parts of the world, to be respectively restored

Third. To appoint commissioners to run the boundary line from the mouth of the river St. Croix to the Bay of Fundy, to ascertain to whom the several islands in the Bay of Passamaquoddy and the Island of Grand Menan belong.

Fourth. To appoint commissioners to ascertain the north-westernmost angle of Nova Scotia, and the north westernmost head of Connecticut river, and to run the boundary line through these points, from the source of the river St. Croix to the river Iroquois, or Cataraguy.

Fifth. To appoint commissioners to run the boundary line from the Iroquois to Lake Superior.

Sixth. The last mentioned commissioners to run the boundary line from Lake Superior to the most north-western point of the Lake of the Woods.

Seventh. Authorizes the commissioners appointed according to the four preceding articles, to employ a secretary, surveyors, and such other persons as they may deem necessary; and provides for their compensation, in such manner as shall be agreed on by the two parties at the exchange of the ratification of the treaty.

Eighth. That a line drawn due north or south (as the case may require) from the most north-western point of the Lake of the Woods, until it shall intersect the forty-ninth parallel of north latitude, and from the point of such intersection due west along and with the said parallel, to be the boundary between the parties as far as their respective territories extend, but not to be construed to extend to the north-west coast, or to territory owned or claimed by either party to the westward of the Stony Mountains.

Ninth. The article concerning Indian pacification already agreed on.

Tenth. For the one party to restrain the Indians living within its dominions from committing hostilities against the other party; and both parties agree not to employ Indians, or admit their co-operation, in their wars with each other.

Eleventh. Each party agrees to exclude from its naval and commercial service the seamen of the other party; not on the high seas, or without its own jurisdiction, to take from ships or vessels of the other, any persons, excepting such as may be in the service of an enemy, and mutually to surrender deserters. This article to be limited in its duration to —— years.

Twelfth. Defining blockade.

Thirteenth. Indemnity for injuries done before and since the commencement

of hostilities, contrary to the established laws of nations?

Fourteenth. A general amnesty for the citizens or subjects of either party who may have sided with the other party in the war, with liberty to sell and remove.

Fifteenth. Relative to the exchange of ratifications.

Such is the general outline of the articles which we presented, and which we accompanied with an explanatory note. In this note we give the adverse party pretty distinctly to understand, that the status ante bellum is a sine qua non, although we do not say so in terms, and we as distinctly give them to understand, that *none* of the other articles would be insisted on by us, which has somewhat the appearance, I confess, of stifling our project at its birth.

I would willingly have had the following sentence omitted, not only because it seemed to me to be *ill timed*, but because it may be construed to mean more than I should like to concede: "The undersigned cannot agree to any other principle than that of a mutual restoration of territory, and have accordingly prepared an article founded on that basis. They are willing even to extend the same principle to the other objects in dispute between the two nations; and in proposing all the other articles included in this project, they wish to be distinctly understood, that they are ready to sign a treaty placing the two countries, in respect to all the subjects of difference between them, in the same state in which they were at the commencement of the present war, reserving to each party all its rights, and leaving whatever may remain of controversy between them for future and pacific negotiation."

After this declaration it cannot be expected that our articles relative to impressment, indemnity, non-employment of Indians, or even amnesty, will be gratuitously accorded by the other party. In offering these articles, by way of experiment, would it not have been well to have given them at least a fair chance of consideration, and to have forced our adversary to assign his reasons for their rejection? We should always have been at liberty to have withdrawn them. It seems, indeed, preposterous to make and to waive a proposition in the same communication. I am afraid, however, that it is something worse than a mere negative proceeding, as applicable to the project itself. I am afraid that it is not only a confession that we are ready to consent to putting an end to the war without having gained a single point for which it was made, and which would imply that for such causes we would not again make war, but admits a construction that the articles of the treaty of 1794, relative to the Mississippi, &c. are to be revived. If it be said that these matters were *no subjects of difference*, it can be answered that it would be absurd to place points that were not in controversy in a worse situation than those which were—to agree not to adjust points that were disputed, and to insist on disputing those which were adjusted; and to mean, by each party's reserving all its rights, the reservation of those only which were denied by the other party. I regret this declaration the more, as I begin to believe that the enemy will avail himself of it, to put an end to a war, by which he, at last, perceives that he has but little chance of obtaining either glory or aggrandizement. The late news from America must have lowered his pretensions, and he will now make peace, unless, from wounded pride, he shall determine on a desperate attempt to redeem his lost honor.

Our note and the project were delivered on the 10th instant, now fourteen days since, and we have as yet received no answer. They have afforded, it appears, matter for consideration, and I should not be surprised if the intelligence by the Fingal, should influence the decision which may be taken upon them. At any rate, the answer we may receive will probably have a definitive character, as the adverse party must either accept our basis or drive us from the negotiation, for I conceive we have nothing more to offer.

Very, &c.

(Signed) JONATHAN RUSSELL.

Copy of a letter from Mr. Russell to Mr. Clay, dated

MENDON, 6*th June*, 1822.

MY DEAR SIR: You will have seen, before this reaches you, the communication to Congress, of what Mr. Adams calls my original and duplicate of a letter, written at Paris, 11th February, 1815, and his remarks on these papers. I have really a great contempt for his part of the performance, and might remain silent, but for the desire expressed by some friends whose opinions I respect, that I should present to the public, at least an explanation on some points. I shall do so accordingly, and, as it will be necessary to appeal to you for confirmation of some of the views and facts which I shall present,

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*

BY GREEN & JARVIS.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, NOVEMBER 8, 1828. No. 36.

particularly those in which you are exclusively or jointly interested, it is important that our memories should perfectly accord with each other.

Mr. Adams pretends to remember that a despatch received on the 24th November, 1814, released us, by permitting the *status ante bellum*, as the basis of negotiation, from the obligation of observing the instruction of the 15th April, 1813, (see paper annexed,) which forbids us to renew the article of the treaty of 1794, "allowing the northwest company and British traders, to carry on trade with the Indian tribes within our limits, a privilege, the pernicious effects of which have been most sensibly felt in the present war"—and commanded us to "*avoid* any stipulation which might restrain the United States from increasing their naval force to any extent they may think proper on the lakes, held in common, or excluding the British traders from the lakes and rivers exclusively within our jurisdiction." He also insinuates, if he may not be said to assert, that being thus released by the despatch received on the 24th November, the proposition relating to the navigation of the Mississippi, and the fishing privilege, had been discussed at the meetings of the mission, on the 28th and 29th of November, and that in consequence of these discussions, that proposition was made to the British Plenipotentiaries, on the 1st of December following. Now I remember distinctly, that the meetings of the mission, at which that proposition was seriously discussed, were commenced, as early, at least, as the 3d of November, and probably the first, and the sense of the American Ministers thereon, when you and I were in the minority, was taken before the 10th of that month. The following facts may serve to refresh your memory—on the 24th of October, we addressed a note to the British Ministers, and repeated our request that the latter would communicate all the other specific propositions (the preliminary article proposed by the British government having been accepted by us) offering a simultaneous exchange of projects by both parties. The British Ministers by their note of the 31st of that month, declined acceding to this proposal, saying, they had already by their note of the 21st of that month, communicated to us all the points upon which they were instructed to insist. After the receipt of this note, I believe we met together every day to decide, first, if we should present a complete project on our part, and then having decided to do so, to digest this project, until the 10th of November, when it was presented. During this period, the proposition in question, after having been repeatedly discussed, was carried in the affirmative, notwithstanding your and my opposition to it. I am very certain one among our objections was its incompatibility with our instructions of the 15th April, 1813, above-mentioned. When I had the pleasure of seeing you at Washington, a few months ago, you then intimated a recollection that this proposition was against our instructions. I examined in consequence all our instructions, and finding none other so much in point, a proposition to bring our right to the fisheries into discussion not being equally so, I was satisfied from your intimation and from my own recollection, that the instruction which you referred to, was that of the 15th April, 1813. It was from this circumstance, that I was induced to add this objection to those which I had stated at Paris. After the majority had decided on making the proposition above-mentioned, as a part of the project, our continued opposition, particularly yours, for it was then that you declared that you would sign no treaty of which such an article should make a part, induced the majority to relax, particularly Mr. Bayard, and to consent to present the project to the British Ministers without such an article; declaring, however, in our note, which accompanied that project, that "in answer to the declaration made by the British Plenipotentiaries, respecting the fisheries, the undersigned, referring to what passed in the conference of the 9th of August, can only state that they are not authorized to bring into discussion any of the rights or liberties which the United States have heretofore enjoyed in relation thereto. From their nature, and from the peculiar character of the treaty of 1783, by which they were recognised, no further stipulation

been deemed necessary by the government of the United States, to entitle them to the full enjoyment of all of them." This paragraph was drawn up by you, as Mr. Adams himself admits; and your sole object in drawing it up was to get rid of the offer of the navigation of the Mississippi as *an equivalent* for the fishing liberty. To induce the majority to go with you, on this point, you adopted the doctrine of the peculiarity of the treaty of 1783. On the 27th of November, the British Ministers returned our projects with marginal alterations and suggestions, and with an explanatory note dated the 26th, the preceding day. The meetings of the American mission on the 28th and 29th, were to deliberate on this communication from the British Ministers, in which not a word was said concerning either the navigation of the Mississippi, or the fishing privilege. If this subject was mentioned by us at those meetings, and possibly it might be, still it is certain that the proposition in relation to it which had been first carried and then waived by the majority, previous to the 10th of that month, was not decided on again, as Mr. Adams more than insinuates. I distinctly remember, and I doubt not your recollection will perfectly accord with mine, that a majority of the mission were surprised when that proposition was offered at the conference on the 1st of December, as such an offer was then *entirely unexpected by them*. Mr. Bayard, in returning with you and me to the Hotel, expressed his disapprobation in very strong terms, that such an offer should have been made so long after the affirmative decision had been taken on it, *without again consulting him*. To show you that my memory has been correct on this point, I will give you an extract from a letter which I addressed to you at Stockholm, on the 15th October, 1815, and which I hope you still have in your possession. In that letter, speaking of Mr. * * * *, I say: "who after having explicitly avowed that the contested liberty of the fisheries was *no equivalent* for the free navigation of the Mississippi, not only insisted that the latter should be offered in consideration of the former, but actually himself, made this offer to the British Ministers in a manner *unexpected and unauthorized* by at least a majority of his colleagues." To show you also that I remember correctly concerning the time when the proposition was really discussed and decided, and the majority relaxed in relation to it, I will give you here, extracts from two letters which I wrote to Mr. Crawford at the time.

In a letter to him, dated at Ghent, the 4th November, 1814, is the following:— "The question which perplexes us the most, is that concerning the fisheries, and we have not yet decided on the mode of proceeding in relation to it. They have told us that the liberty of taking, drying, and curing fish within the exclusive jurisdiction of Great Britain, will not be continued to us without an equivalent. We cannot relinquish this liberty, and we cannot offer territory as an equivalent. Shall we then offer the free navigation of the Mississippi, which they apparently suggested with this view? I think this will be carried in the affirmative, although I have very serious objections to the measure."

In another letter to him, of the 24th November, 1814, I say: "Without having been deceived relative to the disposition of the majority on the subject of the free navigation of the Mississippi, I am happy to inform you that this disposition was *not inflexible*, and we finally transmitted our project without the article that had at first been carried. This article was as follows: 'The right and liberty of the people and inhabitants of the United States, to take, dry, and cure fish, in places within the exclusive jurisdiction of Great Britain, as recognised and secured by the former treaty of peace, and the privilege of the navigation of the Mississippi within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, as secured to the subjects of Great Britain, by the same treaty, are hereby recognised and confirmed.'

"Besides the objections to such an article which had occurred to you, and which had not escaped us, the blending the two points together and making them mutually dependant on each other, which was not done in the treaty of 1783, made this article the more objectionable."

I think we must remember alike, concerning the transactions above referred to, and leave you to draw inferences.

There are other points in which we ought, and I believe shall agree. Mr. Adams in his remarks, you will perceive, has made us *assent* to his principle, & even to the proposition in question. 1st, Because you presented the paragraph above-mentioned, of our note of the 10th of November, admitting the *peculiar* character of the treaty of 1783, and because the mission unanimously accepted it. He

says that I, and of course you, assented to the proposition, because it "was made by the *whole of the American mission*, as may be seen by the protocol of the conference of the 1st of December, 1814, and by the letter from the American to the British Plenipotentiaries of the 14th December, 1814, which says, "to such an article, *which they viewed as merely declaratory*, the undersigned had no objection, and have offered to accede;" and Mr. Adams says, that, to that letter the name of Mr. Russell is subscribed. He might have added also your name. Now I consider all this as quibbling, and shall so treat it; and I trust I shall be supported by your opinion—with regard to the adoption of the principle of Mr. Adams, with respect to the peculiar character of the treaty of 1783, &c. in the paragraph which you furnished for the note of the 10th of November, it was assented to by us on that occasion, as the only means of obtaining the consent of the majority, to the only expedient which was left to get rid of the proposal already decided on by that majority, of giving the free navigation of the Mississippi for the fishing privilege. That principle was admitted by us for that object, on that occasion only. We considered it as a mere pretext, that thus used might do good, but could so far do no harm. Whatever influence it might have on the British ministry, it had a salutary one on our colleagues, by inducing them to waive their proposal—whenever that principle or pretext or any other was advanced and applied to sanction the British claim to the free navigation of the Mississippi, we uniformly held it to be unsound, and resisted it accordingly. With regard to the protocol of the 1st of December, it was like all other protocols, a mere record of facts—and the fact that that proposition was made to the British ministers, in no way implied the *unanimous* consent of the American ministers to such proposition; our signing the letter of the 14th of December, 1814, after the proposition *had been made*, acknowledging that fact, cannot be evidence of your consent or mine to its being made, or of our approbation of it. On the contrary, our assent to view it as merely *declaratory*, was to diminish the evil which it might produce as it stood when offered, and preventing it as far as possible from being considered as containing mutual equivalents, and thus permitting the British claim to the navigation of the Mississippi to stand on other or better ground than that on which it would have stood under the mere revival of the treaty of 1783. If we had not been able to prevent its being offered, still we were willing to circumscribe its meaning as much as possible.

I showed to you at the time the letter which I wrote at Paris, and you coincided with me in the grounds there taken for our opposition. I shall state this fact, and hope, should occasion require, you will confirm it. Mr. Adams, throughout his remarks, asserts or insinuates that I took no part in the debate on this subject, or said less on it than any other member of the mission, or gave perhaps a silent vote, &c. Now, although I do not pretend to have said as much as you against this proposition, yet I did say more against it, and with more earnestness than on any other subject where there was a diversity of opinion.

In the publication which I intend first making, and which will appear before I can hear from you, I shall control my feelings as much as possible, and act on the defensive only. There will be time enough afterwards to take a different course.

I have hastily written to you, my good friend, this long letter, to freshen your memory, and to throw myself on your justice and friendship to do all you can, with truth and propriety, to rescue me from the virulence and falsehood of my malignant and mean calumniator.

It consoles me not a little that Mr. Adams by avowing in his rage that the free navigation of the Mississippi is of no more importance than the right to us of navigating the Bridgewater canal, or the Danube, has settled his fate in your quarter, and will gain him nothing here. A line from you, under existing circumstances, would be particularly satisfactory.

Faithfully and cordially yours,
(Signed) JONATHAN RUSSELL.

I cannot close this letter without taking notice of the conduct of Mr. Adams in getting his remarks before the public. After the first strange message of the President, Mr. Adams, seeing that no call in consequence of it was made, went on the 6th of May to the House of Representatives, in person, and applied to Eustis to make the call, but he declined; Mr. Adams then procured little Mr. Fuller to perform this task. Fuller made the call the same day; the papers were communicated on the 7th, and the House adjourned on the 7th. I had left Wash.

lugion on the 5th. Was it fair towards me, was it respectful towards the House, thus to time the obtrusion of such a scurrilous paper on the House to abuse an absent member? I hope some member may be found properly to notice this, next session.

Copy of a letter from H. Clay to Mr. Russell.

LEXINGTON, *9th July*, 1822.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 6th ultimo, arrived whilst I was absent from home, at one of the watering places, and hence the delay of my answer. I had read the communication of the President to Congress of your letters and Mr. Adams' remarks. And I must frankly say to you, that the variations between your two letters has given, in the public judgment, a great advantage to Mr. Adams, at least for the moment, and that unless satisfactorily explained, it will do you a lasting prejudice. I saw it with very deep regret, and shall anxiously look for an explanation.

On many of the circumstances stated in your letter, my memory accords with yours; on one or two only it does not. I recollect distinctly, that the paragraph offered by me and inserted in our despatch to the British Commissioners of the 10th November, terminated, at that time, the discussions respecting the navigation of the Mississippi, and the privilege concerning the fisheries within the British jurisdiction. It was prior to the adoption of that paragraph that it had been proposed, I think by Mr. Gallatin, to grant the one for the other, that the discussion, which was long, earnest, animated, often renewed, had taken place; that a majority consisting of Messrs. Gallatin, Adams and Bayard, appeared to be in favor of it; and that I had declared that I would sign no treaty in which such a stipulation should be included. After this declaration, Mr. Bayard came over to us' and made us the majority. It was then necessary that we should, as we were about to send in to the British Commissioners the project of a treaty of peace, give some *written* answer to their notification of the 8th of August, concerning the fisheries. We were forbidden, by our instructions, to suffer our right to the fisheries to be brought into discussion. The majority had now determined not to offer for the renewal of our right to the navigation of the Mississippi. We had, in short, no equivalent to offer. We had, therefore, no other ground to take than that which the above paragraph assumes. Whether solid or not, it was the best we could occupy, and had the advantage of being in conformity to our instructions.

After the British Commissioners returned our project, with an alteration proposing the renewal to them of the right to navigate the Mississippi, I think the same question, though in a form somewhat different, came up in our commission. We received their note, with their proposed alterations and suggestions, on the 27th of November. We had a conference with them on the first of December. I think it must have been between those two days that the question was again considered. You and I (such, at least, is my recollection.) proposed to strike out that part of the British alteration of the 8th article, which had for its object the renewal of their right to navigate the Mississippi; but the same majority that was at first in favor of making the offer of the navigation of that river, was now willing to accept the British proposal, upon the condition of their renewing to us the fishing liberty within their jurisdiction. The article proposed at the conference on the first of December, expressed the sense of the majority. My determination on this subject, had been deliberately formed, and communicated frankly to my colleagues. I did not probably repeat the communication of my resolution, because it would have worn the appearance of menace. I have some recollection of Mr. Bayard, on our return from the conference of the 1st of December, having expressed his dissatisfaction with something which Mr. G* * * said or did at the conference; but what it was I do not recollect. I cannot think it possible that we should have gone into that conference without being prepared to say something to the British commissioners on the subject of the navigation of the Mississippi, and my recollection is very strong that the above majority was in favor of accepting their proposal, with the condition which I have mentioned. I regret that I cannot put my hands upon your letter from Stockholm, mentioned in your last.

Nothing can be more unfounded than Mr. Adams' inference, (if he intended to draw an inference,) of our assent to the doctrine of the imperishable character, in all respects, of the treaty of 1783, and to the proposal in regard to the navigation of the Mississippi, from the fact of our

signature to the communication, respecting those subjects, to the British commissioners, and that of our being present at the conference of the 1st of December.

1. As to the durable character of the treaty. I think all of us, (except Mr. Adams,) concurred in believing that the provisions respecting the fishing grants *within the British exclusive jurisdiction*, and the navigation of the Mississippi, expired on the breaking out of the war. Why he calls it the American doctrine I do not know. If it be true, it is the doctrine of the public law. If he means to say that it is American, because we were most interested in maintaining it, he is mistaken. If the superiority of interest should determine the national character of the doctrine, it ought to be called British. Then why did we take the ground which we did, in our note of the 10th of November? For the reason already assigned. It was the best we could occupy. It was plausible, and might serve, as probably it subsequently did serve, to enable us to make some satisfactory arrangement with Great Britain in regard to the fisheries. We were bound to say something, or acknowledge, by our silence, the principle asserted by the British commissioners, on the 8th of August. By taking the ground which we did, if it were not absolutely tenable we were better off than to have stood mute.

2. As to the navigation of the Mississippi: that the offer of it was the work of a majority, in which we did not participate, cannot be denied. What puts this matter conclusively at rest is, the despatch signed by all the American commissioners to the Secretary of State, under date the 25th of December, accompanying the treaty, in which it is stated: "To place both points [i. e. the navigation and the fisheries,] beyond all future controversy, a *majority* of us determined to offer to admit an article confirming both rights." You will no doubt recollect, that I suggested when we went to sign that despatch, the insertion of the words "a majority;" and my purpose for doing it was not mistaken. Why did we sign the communication to the British Commissioners of the 14th of December; and why were we present at the conference of the first, without objecting to that article? If we had failed to subscribe that communication, or if we had objected to the article at the conference, it would have, in effect, notified to the British Commissioners a serious division amongst us, than which nothing could have been more unfortunate. Our signatures nor our presence no more proved our assent to the article, than the signature of an arbitrator to an award proves his assent to it when it was carried by the majority against his opinion, or the assent by a member of an aggregate body to all the transactions of that body which happened during his presence; all that it was material to the British Commissioners to know was, that the offer was the act of the American Commissioners, which it would equally have been, whether carried unanimously, by a majority of four, or a majority of three. How it was carried, (that is, by what majority,) it was not necessary for them to know, but might to us have been highly injurious. But it was material that our own government, to which we were responsible, should know how we did act; and accordingly, when we came to address it, we informed it that it was the affair of the majority, &c.

It was the less necessary for us to disclose the fatal secret of our divisions to the enemy, because the proposition might be rejected, might be modified during the negotiation so as ultimately to be acceptable or less objectionable to us, or finally might be withdrawn. It was withdrawn; and, thereby, that was ultimately done, which we at first proposed, and a clear demonstration was given of the indiscretion which would have characterized a gratuitous disclosure of the divisions among the American Commissioners.

When I spoke to you at Washington, of our instructions being opposed to the article in question, I alluded more particularly to that part of them which related to the fisheries, our right to which we were forbidden to discuss, &c.

The authority to treat on the basis of the status ante bellum, which we did not receive until two or three weeks after the discussion in our board, which, as before mentioned, was closed by the paragraph in our dispatch of the 10th of November, did not authorize us to propose the article which we did, concerning the navigation of the Mississippi, if, as I think, that article in effect would have amounted to a grant of the navigation, in the whole extent of the river from the source to the Balize. For what was the status ante bellum of that subject? The subjects of Great Britain had no right, either by the treaty of 1783 or by that of 1794, to navigate that river within the Spanish jurisdiction; and the sovereign rights of Spain over that river, were not vested in

us until the conclusion of the treaty of Louisiana in 1803. It has been said that, during thirty years no use was made by British subjects of the navigation of that river. During a great part of the same thirty years, (until the year 1795,) no use, for purposes of commerce, was made of it by the citizens of the United States; and for the same reason, in both instances; that is, that Spain held both sides of it, from the mouth to the 31st degree of north latitude, and the west side up to its source.

Nothing would be more painful to me than to be drawn, even remotely, into the unhappy controversy between Mr. Adams and yourself—a controversy in which the party the most successful, will be a loser in the public estimation. I certainly thought that the public ought to have been put in possession of the whole of the official transactions of the mission of Ghent, not knowing myself of any sufficient reason for withholding any part of them. But I do not think that any *private* letters ought to have been communicated by the President. Far from stimulating, as I think he did, perhaps unintentionally, a call upon him for your letter along with Mr. Adams' remarks, he ought, in my opinion, to have refused such a call, however unequivocally made. Your letter, which I believe you showed me at Paris, I supposed was written to explain the grounds on which you had proceeded, and to be used defensively, upon the possible contingency of misrepresentation or misconception of your course. No such contingency had occurred.

What would aggravate the pain which I should feel, even at the necessity of my testifying to any of the transactions at Ghent, in a controversy between two of my colleagues, is a consideration of the relation, in regard to the subject, in which I stood to Mr. Adams; the relation in which I now stand to him, and in which we both appear to the public, and the friendly relation which I have ever borne to you. I should hope that a necessity may not arise for me to appear in any form before the public. Would it not be most advisable for you to state what really occurred, without appealing to any person to confirm your statement? Would not such an appeal be a departure from self respect and self dignity, as implying a consciousness that it was necessary? Already, I understand, it has been said, at the metropolis of a great State, that I have prompted the call for *your letter*, than which nothing can be more incorrect. I mention the incident, not that I care for it, but to show you the distrustful state of the public mind.

This letter is not written for the public eye, but for your own. I am most anxious to see the publication, which you intimate was shortly to appear after the date of your letter. So far as the subject and the argument are concerned, you cannot fail to achieve a signal triumph over your antagonist. And I repeat, in conclusion, the hope that, so far as there is any thing personal, you will be able fully to vindicate yourself in respect to the variance between your two letters.

Be pleased to present my best respects to Mrs. Russell; and believe me sincerely and cordially yours.

(Signed) H. CLAY.

The Honorable Mr. RUSSELL.

P. S. In the session of Congress of 1815–16, in a debate on the state of the Union, I addressed the House of Representatives, in vindication of the war, the terms of the peace, &c. In the course of my speech I stated that *a majority* of the American commissioners had made the offer of the navigation of the Mississippi for the fishing liberties. My speech was published in the Intelligencer and other prints of the day.

H. C.

Copy of a letter from Jonathan Russe to Henry Clay.

MENDON, *7th August*, 1822.

My Dear Sir: I received, by the last mail, your letter of the 9th ultimo. All the abuse of Mr. Adams, and of his satellites, has not given me so much pain as the mild intimation of your disapprobation. What is done cannot be undone. My greatest error, however, has been in placing any confidence in the candor of Mr. Adams. It was my intention to have acquainted him with the variations, and to have left him, with this knowledge, free to act as he might think proper. It was for this purpose I called at the Department with the exact copy in my pocket, but before I saw him, he and the *President* had found the original, and the mischief was done. The coarse and violent manner in which he introduced the subject, made it impossible for me to deprecate his hostility, by declaring the intention with which I had called on him Such a declaration, under such circumstances indeed, was not only repugnant

to my feelings, but would have been worse than useless, and merely exposed me to an additional affront. I now make this declaration to you, because you are my friend, but, on the rack, I would not make it to my enemies. After this explosion with Mr. Adams, I called on Mr. Monroe, and stated to him what [illegible] been my intentions, and my will [illegible] either paper should be communicated, or neither; and he emphatically assured me that neither should be [illegible] to the House, as he would [illegible] the organ of personal hostility; yet, two days afterwards, he sent his strange message of the 4th of May, which took from him all control over the proceedings. Thus I have been made the victim of the ferocity of the one, and the perfidy of the other. There is a circumstance in the conduct of Mr. Adams relative to the fishing question, with which, perhaps, you are not acquainted. He wrote to his *father*, at the time, an account of the transaction, and the part which he had taken, and the doctrine which he had asserted. His father sent this letter to James Lloyd, now a Senator in Congress, apparently with a request to furnish his views on the subject. Mr. Lloyd, on the 8th of March, 1815, addressed a letter of several sheets to the Ex-President, in which he gave a most exaggerated account of the importance of the fishing privilege, and a very jesuitical comment on our imperishable right to it. He says, "it is a gem which should never be surrendered, nor can it ever be abandoned *by any statesman alive to the interests of his country.* Compared, in its consequences, with a free right of navigating the Mississippi, it is even a much more unequal stake than would be six French rapiers imponed against six Barbary horses." In another place he says: "She" (Great Britain,) "has, therefore, notwithstanding *the opinion of two of the* American commissioners, and her own probable pretensions of fairness, given up nothing, in point of value, compared with the fisheries, which, upon the same ground, she is undoubtedly desirous of fortifying herself in withholding." This sapient treatise of Mr. Lloyd was sent by the father to Washington, and is there carefully preserved in the Department of State. I have reason to believe that it has even been sent to the legation at London, to have an influence there. Thus it is, that, notwithstanding Mr. Adams' rage against *private* letters, that we have been denounced in secret. All this in confidence; for I do not wish it to be known at this time that I possess a copy of this letter. It may possibly be used with some advantage hereafter. You will perceive that I appealed to your recollection in my explanations on one point only, and as [illegible] your memory does not, it [illegible] accord [illegible] with mine, [illegible] of the less importance, as [illegible] undoubtedly you [illegible]. All I meant to say in my explanations on this point, was, that the instructions received on the 24th of November had no influence on the decisions of the board in relation to the Mississippi, and that the majority and minority continued the same as before, and that there was then no serious discussion or regular division on the subject. I am clear in my recollection, that the dissatisfaction of Mr. Bayard related to the offer made on the 1st December: and although he was still with the majority, yet the offer was made at a time and in a manner unexpected by him. Now, my good friend, you may rest assured that I shall do nothing that can injure you. Although Adams has hurt the feelings of my friends, and perhaps injured me, he has gained nothing for himself by indulging in a tone unbecoming a candidate for the highest and greatest dignity in this Republic. All this in confidence.

For the present I shall take no further public notice of Mr. Adams or his rhapsodies. He smothers the merits of the case in a cloud of vituperation. His rejoinder is a mere *duplicate* of his remarks. He avoids all argument, and deals only in abuse. Any further explanation on my part would be followed by another repetition of the same scurrility on his, and tend only to keep up, I am sorry to say, the unfavorable excitement of the public. However pure and patriotic might have been my views; however just to myself or friendly towards you, still my indiscretion in confiding to any thing like magnanimity or liberality in Mr. Adams, has unfortunately given him such an accidental advantage, which he is disposed to abuse, even to excess, against me, that I cannot hope, at present, to obtain a triumph over the prejudices which he has sought to enlist against me. He has too many *printers* and *clerks* under his patronage to furnish essays and evidence, to leave me a chance of encountering him with advantage. Some of the assertions in his rejoinder are totally unfounded, and the declarations of Brent and Bailey, particularly the latter, contain many

things worse than mistakes. Besides these objections to the continuance of a personal and newspaper controversy with Mr. Adams on the *present ground*, I have on my hands a libel which more seriously affects my good fame, and which will leave me no time, and scarcely inclination, to attend to lesser slanders. You will have seen in the public papers the infamous libel to which I allude. With you I trust I need no defence against such a charge. I will, however, enclose you a copy of a letter which I have just received from Frederic Mullet, a partner in the house designated by Hunt. Mr. Mullet is the very best witness the case admits, and you will perceive that he is disposed to do ample justice. I will frankly confess that all these things weigh upon my heart, and make me feel the want of, at least, the charity of my friends to lighten it.

Mrs. Russell, who has, since her return home, presented me with another daughter, gratefully acknowledges your kind remembrance of her. Remember me, in return, I pray you, respectfully, to Mrs. Clay.

With great respect and regard, devotedly and faithfully your friend.

JONATHAN RUSSELL.

Copy of a letter from H. Clay to Jonathan Russell.

COLUMBUS, *4th September*, 1822.

MY DEAR SIR: Being at this place attending the Federal Court of Ohio, your letter, under date the 7th ultimo, addressed to me at Lexington, has been forwarded to me here. I assure you, most sincerely, that it gave me as much pain to make, as it could possibly you to receive, "the mild intimation of my disapprobation," in regard to the unfortunate error which, I think, you committed in the variance between your two letters. I thought it due to our mutual friendship that I should speak, in its genuine spirit, without disguise. But I will not dwell on that unpleasant subject. "What is done cannot be undone," and I would rather sooth, your feelings, than add, in the smallest degree, to your afflictions. I have no doubt that you were dealt with, by the persons to whom you refer, with great duplicity, and *that one* of them even sought to produce the very state of things which exists. So far as the controversy is a personal one, I do not see that a continuance of it in the newspapers is likely to be profitable to you. So far as it respects the public grounds of difference between Mr. Adams and you—the respective values of the fishing liberty and the navigation of the Mississippi, and the continued operation of the provisions of the former treaty of peace—much more might be said, and advantageously said. These are, in truth, the only grounds in which the public at large has a deep and extensive interest, and it has so happened heretofore, that they have occupied the least prominent position in your controversy. As Mr. Adams has avowed his intention of appealing to the public, in another form, in relation to these grounds, you may have an opportunity, if you think proper to embrace it, to resume the subject under better auspices.

I think I have seen the letter of Mr. Lloyd to which you refer. I recollect it rather from his strange figure of the French rapiers and the Barbary horses than from its argument. I feel so perfectly confident in the propriety of the opinions which we held at Ghent, in regard to the navigation of the Mississippi and the fishing liberty, that I should not be provoked, by the eccentricities of Mr. Lloyd, to engage in any public vindication of them. A great part of the nation is now surprised, and all of it will before long wonder, that any person could ever think of exchanging the one for the other.

I had seen the production of Ariel, and have read the correspondence which subsequently passed between its author and you, as I have also observed the proceedings which you have instituted against him. I never could doubt the baseness of his calumny, and rejoice to find, from the copy of the letter which you transmitted to me, that you will have it in your power to expose its atrocity, and to manifest to the world that the opinion which it has entertained of your probity rests upon a solid foundation. In this controversy I am persuaded that you have all the sympathies of the public on your side. And I trust that your complete vindication, which I anticipate as certain, will go far to efface any unfavorable impression which has been made by your affair with Mr. Adams.

Our elections to Congress have just terminated in Kentucky. I am returned without opposition, though with some reluctance on my part.

With great regard, I am faithfully and cordially your friend.

(Signed,) H. CLAY.

JONATHAN RUSSELL, Esq.

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—*Extra.*

This paper will be devoted exclusively to the Presidential Election, and be published weekly until the 15th of October next, for *One Dollar;* subject to newspaper postage, and *no more.*
BY DUFF GREEN.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, JANUARY 24, 1829. No. 36.

TO THE SUBSCRIBERS TO THE EXTRA TELEGRAPH.

In No. 32 of this paper, I promised to give another number, containing a Table of Contents, and a Statement of the Electoral Votes. I have waited until now, hoping to obtain a correct return of the votes in Mississippi. The table is not as complete as I wished to make it, but the deficiency as to the returns of the late election is more than supplied by the additional memoranda of the former, which, in the condensed form they are given, will gratify the curious, and enhance the volume of the "Extra" as a book of reference.

It is believed that all the Electors who voted for General Washington, in 1798, are dead, except Mr. Roane, of Virginia, who is now a member of the present Congress; if so, Mr. Roane is the eldest federal officer in the United States.

In the same number we gave notice of our intention to enlarge our daily, country, and weekly paper. I have taken the liberty to send a copy of the weekly, on the enlarged size, to the subscribers to the Extra, under the hope that many of them may be induced to subscribe for it—and in anticipation of orders, have printed a large edition, commencing with the present session of Congress. I have been at much expense to obtain the best reporters, and the Weekly Telegraph will contain a more accurate and enlarged report of the proceedings of Congress and official papers, than has ever been given to the public on the same terms.

Experience has convinced me, that the only way to avoid ruin, is to enforce punctuality on the part of my subscribers. I have therefore resolved to adopt the following regulations, which, it is hoped, will be acceptable to subscribers, whilst they protect me from the heavy losses heretofore sustained.

TERMS OF PUBLICATION.

The UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH is published daily, tri-weekly, (during the session of Congress, and twice a week during the recess,) and weekly. The daily paper for ten—the tri-weekly for six—and the weekly for four dollars. All payments in advance. To Agents it will be sent

For the daily, at seven dollars per annum.
Tri-weekly, four do. do.
Weekly, at two do. do.

Annual advertising customers will receive a daily paper, and the use of one square, renewable once a week for one year, at fifty dollars; new advertisements to have at least one insertion in the inner form of the country paper.

Advertisements in the weekly, at the rate of one dollar for each insertion, not exceeding one square.

Advertisements in the daily and country, at the rate of one dollar per square, for the first three, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent continuous insertion. If ordered once a week, thirty-seven and a half cents per square for each additional insertion. No advertisements for less than one dollar. All *material* alterations are considered as new advertisements. Each distant order for an advertisement must proceed from an Agent, be accompanied by the cash, or enclosed through some responsible person in the District.

Advertisements in the District must be accompanied by the cash, or satisfactory arrangements.

All agents will be considered responsible for advertisements ordered by them, and the amount charged in their accounts, and a commission of twenty-five per cent. allowed thereon.

All money due me from Agents or others, may be transmitted, at my risk, by mail.—Agents will be required to settle their accounts quarterly, to-wit: on the first of December, March, June and September of each year, except in cases where the sum due is less than twenty dollars per annum, in which case remittances must be made semi-annually, in advance, on the first of June and December. In all cases the postage must be paid by our correspondents. This item of our expenditure is onerous in the extreme.

I am desirous to obtain an agent at each post office where as many as five subscribers can be had, and hope that these terms proposed will invite a competition, and ensure the success of my plan. In some cases the subscribers themselves have made arrangements with each other, and remitted the amount through one of them. They have been credited as though the person selected was an Agent; although I would prefer, in all cases, the appointment of a regular Agent.

The advantages which the extended circulation of this paper will give to all advertising customers, it is believed will induce many "

vail themselves of its columns; and the terms offered to Agents, it is hoped, will stimulate them to use some exertions to obtain advertisements as well as subscribers.

The papers sent to an office will be forwarded in the name of the Agent, who will obtain and keep his accounts with his own subscribers; and in all cases where an Agent fails to make his remittance in due time, he is liable to removal, and he alone will be responsible to those who may have paid money to him on account of the paper. DUFF GREEN.

All Agents are required to give bond in the following form:

Know all men by these presents, that we, as principal, and as security, are held and firmly bound unto Duff Green, his heirs and assigns, in the penal sum of dollars; for the payment of which, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our heirs, executors, or administrators, upon the condition following, to wit:

Whereas, the said hath been appointed by the said Duff Green, an Agent, at as explained in the proposals of the said Green, hereto attached: if the said shall duly transmit, by mail, quarterly or semi-annually, as the case may be, all sums due from him to the said Green, on account of his said agency, then, in that case, the said obligation to be null and void; otherwise, to remain in full force and effect in law.

In testimony whereof, we have hereunto set our hands and seals, this day of 182 .

L. S.
L. S.

FIRST PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

1789.—GEORGE WASHINGTON was unanimously elected President of the United States, and JOHN ADAMS elected Vice President, by the following vote, for four years from the 4th March, 1789:

Number of votes to which each State is entitled.	STATES.	George Washington.	John Adams.	Samuel Huntingdon.	John Jay.	John Hancock.	Robert H. Harrison.	George Clinton.	John Rutledge.	John Milton.	James Armstrong.	Edward Telfair.	Benjamin Lincoln.
5	N. Hampshire,	5	5	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
10	Massachusetts,	10	10	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
7	Connecticut,	7	5	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
6	New Jersey,	6	1	.	5	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
10	Pennsylvania,	10	8	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
3	Delaware,	3	.	.	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
6	Maryland,	6	.	.	.	.	6	.	.	.	.	.	.
10	Virginia,	10	5	.	1	1	.	3	.	.	.	.	.
7	S. Carolina,	7	.	.	.	1	.	.	6	.	.	.	.
5	Georgia,	5	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	1	1
69		69	34	2	9	4	6	3	6	2	1	1	1

Names of Electors of President and Vice President of the United States, for the first election for four years, from the 4th March, 1789

GEORGE WASHINGTON, President,
JOHN ADAMS, Vice President.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Benjamin Bellows, Ebenezer Thompson,
John Pickering, John Parker.
John Sullivan,

MASSACHUSETTS.

Caleb Davis, David Sewall,
Samuel Phillips, Jr. Walter Spooner,
Francis Dana, Moses Gill,
Samuel Henshaw, William Cushing,
William Sever, William Shepard.

CONNECTICUT.

Samuel Huntington, Erastus Wolcott,
Oliver Wolcott, Thaddeus Burr,
Richard Law, Jedediah Huntington.
Mathew Griswold,

NEW JERSEY.

David Brearley, David Moore,
James Kinsey, John Rutherford,
John Neilson, Matthias Ogden.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Edward Hand, James Wilson,
George Gibson, James O'Harra,
John Arndt, David Grier,
Collinson Read, Samuel Potts,
Lawrence Keene, Alexander Graydon

DELAWARE.

Gunning Bedford, George Mitchell.
John Baning,

MARYLAND.

John Rogers, Philip Thomas,
George Plater, Robert Smith,
William Tilghman, William Richardson.
Alexander C. Hanson, William Matthews.

VIRGINIA.

Patrick Henry, W. Tilghugh,
John Pride, Edward Stevens,
Zachariah Johnston, Anthony Walke,
James Wood, David Stuart,
John Harvie, John Roane.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Christopher Gadsden, Edward Rutledge,
Henry Lawrens, Arthur Simkins,
Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Thomas Heyward, Jr
John F. Grimke.

GEORGIA.

George Handley, John Wilson,
George Walton, H. Osborne.
John King,

SECOND PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

1793.—GEORGE WASHINGTON was elected President of the United States, unanimously, and JOHN ADAMS Vice President, by a plurality of votes, for four years, from the 4th of March, 1793, as follows:

Number of votes to which each State is entitled.	STATES.	George Washington.	John Adams.	George Clinton.	Thomas Jefferson.	Aaron Burr.
6	New Hampshire,	6	6			
16	Massachusetts,	16	16			
4	Rhode Island,	4	4			
9	Connecticut,	9	9			
3	Vermont,	3	3			
12	New York,	12	.	12		
7	New Jersey,	7	7			
13	Pennsylvania,	15	14	1		
3	Delaware,	3	3			
8	Maryland,	8	8			
21	Virginia,	21	.	21		
4	Kentucky,	4	.	.	4	
12	North Carolina,	12	.	12		
8	South Carolina,	8	7	.	.	1
4	Georgia,	4	.	4		
132		132	77	50	4	1

Names of Electors of President and Vice President of the United States for the second election for four years, from the 4th March, 1793.

GEORGE WASHINGTON, President,
JOHN ADAMS, Vice President.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Josiah Bartlett,	Benjamin Bellows,
John T. Gilman,	John Pickering,
Jonathan Freeman,	Ebenezer Thompson.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Azor Orne,	Francis Dana,
Samuel Holten,	Ebenezer Ma toon, Jr.
Thomas Dawes,	William Sever,
Increase Sumner,	Walter Spooner,
Moses Gill,	Solomon Freeman,
William Shepard,	Nathaniel Wells,
Thompson J. Skinner,	Daniel Cony,
Dwight Foster,	Peleg Wadsworth.

RHODE ISLAND.

Arthur Fenner,	Samuel J. Potter,
George Champlin,	William Greene.

CONNECTICUT.

Samuel Huntington,	John Davenport, Jr.
Oliver Wolcott,	Thomas Grosvenor,
David Austin,	Elijah Hubbard,
Thomas Seymour,	Sylvester Gilbert.
Marvin Wait,	

VERMONT.

Samuel Hitchcock,	Lemuel Chipman,
Lot Hall,	Paul Brigham.

NEW YORK.

Jesse Woodhull,	David VanNess,
Edward Savage,	Samuel Clark,
Johannes Bruyn,	Abraham Yates, Jr.
William Floyd,	Volkert Veeder,
Abraham TenEyck,	Stephen Ward,
John Bay,	Samuel Osgood.

NEW JERSEY.

Thomas H. Sanderson,	Aaron D. Woodruff,
Richard Stockton,	John W Vancleve,
Joseph Bloomfield,	Samuel Dick.
Franklin Davenport,	

PENNSYLVANIA.

William Henry,	Robert Coleman,
Joseph Huster,	Thomas Bull,
Thomas McKean,	Cornelius Coxe,
Henry Miller,	Robert Johnston,
John Wilkins, Jr.	John Boyd.
David Stewart,	James Morris,
George Latimer,	Robert Hare.
Hugh Lloyd,	

DELAWARE.

James Sykes,	Gunning Bedford.
William Hill Wells,	

MARYLAND.

Alexander C. Hanson,	John Sency,
John Eager Howard,	Levin Winder,
Thomas Sim Lee,	William Smith,*
Richard Potts,	Samuel Hughes.*
William Richardson,	——
Donaldson Yates,	* Not present.

VIRGINIA.

John Wise,	George Carrington,
Nathaniel Wilkinson,	John Early,
William O. Callis,	Catesby Jones,
Elias Langham,	Daniel C. Brent,
John Dawson,	Stephen T. Mason,
John Roane, Jr.	Moses Hunter,
James Murdough,	Archibald Stuart,
Michael Bailey,	John Bowyer,
Thomas Claiborne,	Maxwell Armstrong,
John Pride,	Claiborne Watkins.
Tarlton Woodson,	

KENTUCKY.

Richard C. Anderson,	Charles Scott,
Benjamin Logan,	Notley Conn.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Stephen Cabarrus,	John Louis Taylor,
Alfred Moore,	John Macon,
Joel Sane,	Richard D. Spaight,
Benjamin Smith,	John M. Binford,
Matthew Lock,	Peter Dange,
James Taylor,	William Porter.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Charles C. Pinckney,	John Chesnut,
Andrew Pickens,	John Hunter,
John Barnwell,	Edward Rutledge,
Robert Anderson,	John Julius Pringle.

GEORGIA.

Benjamin Tahaferro,	William Gibbons,
John King,	Seaborn Jones.

THIRD PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

1797.—JOHN ADAMS was elected President, and THOMAS JEFFERSON Vice President, for four years from the 4th of March, 1797, by the following vote:

Number of votes to which each State is entitled.	STATES.	John Adams.	Thomas Jefferson.	Thomas Pinkney.	Aaron Burr.	Samuel Adams.	Oliver Ellsworth.	John Jay.	George Clinton.	Samuel Johnston.	James Iredell.	George Washington.	Charles C. Pinkney.	John Henry.
3	Tennessee,	.	3	.	3									
4	Kentucky,	.	4	.	4									
4	Georgia,	.	4	.	.	.	.	.	4					
8	S. Carolina,	.	8	8										
12	N. Carolina,	1	11	1	6	.	.	.	.	.	3	1	1	
21	Virginia,	1	20	1	1	15	.	.	3	.	.	1		
10	Maryland,	7	4	4	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	
3	Delaware,	3	.	3										
15	Pennsylvania,	1	14	2	13									
7	New Jersey,	7	.	7										
12	New York,	12	.	12										
9	Connecticut,	9	.	4										
4	Rhode Island,	4	.	.	.	4								
16	Massachusetts,	16	.	13	.	.	1	.	.	2				
4	Vermont,	4	.	4										
6	N. Hampshire,	6	.	.	.	.	6							
140		71	68	59	30	15	11	5	7	2	3	2	1	

ames of Electors of President and Vice President of the United States for the third election, for four years from the 4th March, 1797.

JOHN ADAMS, President,
THOMAS JEFFERSON, Vice President.

TENNESSEE.

Daniel Smith, Hugh Neilson.
Joseph Greer,

KENTUCKY.

Stephen Ormsby, Caleb Wallace,
Isaac Shelby, John Coburn.

GEORGIA.

James Jackson, Charles Abercrombie,
Edward Telfair, William Barnett.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Edward Rutledge, Arthur Simkins,
Andrew Pickens, William Thomas,
John Chesnut, John Mathews,
Thomas Taylor, John Rutledge, Jr.

NORTH CAROLINA.

James Martin, Richard D. Spaight,
Gabriel Ragsdale, John Gray Blount
John Hamilton, of G. William Edmunds,
James Bradley, John Hamilton, of P.
William Martin, Evan Alexander,
Anthony Brown, Sterling Harwell.

VIRGINIA.

William Nimmo, William Terry,
Nathaniel Wilkinson, David Saunders,
John Taylor, Catesby Jones,
Wilson Cary Nicholas, Daniel Carroll Brent,
William Madison, Levin Powell,
Benjamin Temple, Moses Hunter,
Josiah Riddick, Archibald Stuart,
John Mason, John Bowyer,
Robert Walker, John Brown,
George Markham, Robert Crockett.
Peter Johnson,

MARYLAND.

John Roushy Plater, John Archer,
Francis Deakins, John Gilpin,
George Murdock, John Roberts,
John Lynn, John Eccleston,
Gabriel Duvall, John Done.

DELAWARE.

Thomas Robinson, Isaac Cooper.
Richard Bassett,

PENNSYLVANIA.

Thomas McKean, John Smilie,
James Boyd, Joseph Heister,
William Brown, John Piper,
John Whitehill, William Irvine,
Peter Muhlenberg, Robert Coleman,
Abraham Smith, Samuel Miles,
Jacob Morgan, William Maclay.
James Hanna,

NEW JERSEY.

John Neilson, Caleb Newbold,
Aaron Ogden, John Blackwood,
Jonathan Rhea, William Colefax.
Elisha Lawrence,

NEW YORK.

Lewis Morris, Rob't VanRensselaer,
Richard Thorne, Peter Cantine, Jr.
Abraham TenBroeck, Obijah Hammond,
AbrahamVanVechten, William Root,
Peter Smith, St.John Honeywood,
Charles Newkirk, Johannes Miller.

CONNECTICUT.

Oliver Wolcott, Jonathan Trumbull,
Jeremiah Wadsworth, Heman Swift,
Elizur Goodrich, William Hart,
Elias Perkins, Jesse Root.
Jonathan Sturges,

RHODE ISLAND.

Arthur Fenner, Samuel J. Potter,
George Champlin, William Greene.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William Sever, Stephen Longfellow,
Samuel Holten, Edward H Robbins,
Elbridge Gerry, Ebenezer Mattoon,
Samuel Phillips, Increase Sumner,
Thomas Dawes, David Rosseter,
Nathaniel Wells, Ebenezer Hunt,
Elisha May, Joseph Allen,
Thomas Rice, Ebenezer Bacon.

VERMONT.

Elijah Dewey, John Bridgman,
Elisha Sheldon, Oliver Gallup.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

John Taylor Gilman, Timothy Farrar,
Oliver Peabody, Ebenezer Thompson,
Benjamin Bellows, Timothy Walker.

FOURTH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

1801.—In 1800 the Electoral College having failed to elect a President of the United States, THOMAS JEFFERSON and AARON BURR having received 73 votes each, a majority of the whole number given, the choice devolved upon the House of Representatives, when Mr. JEFFERSON was elected President —AARON BURR being, consequently, the Vice President chosen by the electors, for four years from the 4th of March, 1801.

The following is the electoral vote from which no choice resulted:

Number of votes to which each State is entitled.	STATES.	Thomas Jefferson.	Aaron Burr.	John Adams.	Charles Cotesworth Pinkney.	John Jay.
6	New Hampshire,	.	.	6	6	
16	Massachusetts,	.	.	16	16	
4	Rhode Island,	.	.	4	3	1
9	Connecticut,	.	.	9	9	
4	Vermont,	.	.	4	4	
12	New York,	12	12			
7	New Jersey,	.	.	7	7	
15	Pennsylvania,	8	8	7	7	
3	Delaware,	.	.	3	3	
10	Maryland,	5	5	5	5	
21	Virginia,	21	21			
4	Kentucky,	4	4			
12	North Carolina,	8	8	4	4	
3	Tennessee,	3	3			
8	South Carolina,	8	8			
4	Georgia,	4	4			
138		73	73	65	64	1

The following is the vote in the House of Representatives:

On the 36th ballot the votes of the several States stood thus:

For Mr. Jefferson.	*For Aaron Burr.*
Vermont,	Rhode Island,
New York,	New Hampshire,
New Jersey,	Connecticut, and
Pennsylvania,	Massachusetts.
Maryland,	
Virginia,	
North Carolina,	
Georgia,	
Kentucky, and	
Tennessee.	

And the votes of two States, viz Delaware and South Carolina, were given blank.

Names of Electors of President and Vice President of the United States for the fourth election, for four years from 4th March, 1801.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, President,
AARON BURR, Vice President.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.	
Oliver Peabody,	Benjamin Bellows,
John Prentice,	Timothy Farrar,
Ebenezer Thompson,	Arthur Livermore.
MASSACHUSETTS.	
Samuel Phillips,	Francis Dana,
Edward H. Robbins,	Samuel Sewall,
David Rosseter,	Theophilus Bradbury,
Ebenezer Hunt,	John Hooker,
Walter Spooner,	Joseph Allen,
William Sever,	Samuel Sumner Wilde,
William Baylies,	Lemuel Weeks,
Thomas Dawes,	Andrew P. Fernald.
RHODE ISLAND.	
George Champlin,	Oliver Davis,
Edward Manton,	William Greene.
CONNECTICUT.	
Jonathan Trumbull,	Jonathan Ingersoll,
John Treadwell,	Tapping Reeve,
Jesse Root,	Matthew Griswold,
Jonathan Sturges,	Jonathan Ogden Mose-
Stephen M. Mitchell,	ley.
VERMONT.	
Elijah Dewey,	Roswell Hopkins,
Jonathan Hunt,	William Chamberlain.
NEW YORK.	
Isaac Ledyard,	Peter Van Ness,
Anthony Lispenard,	Robert Ellis,
Pierre Van Cortlandt,	John Woodworth,
Jr.	Jeremiah Van Rensse-
James Burt,	laer,
Gilbert Livingston,	Jacob Eaker,
Thomas Jenkins,	William Floyd.
NEW JERSEY.	
Isaac Smith,	Samuel S. Smith,
Thomas Sinnickson,	Matthias Williamson,
Richard Stockton,	Jr.
Joshua L. Howell,	William Griffith.
PENNSYLVANIA.	
Frederick Kuhn,	Samuel Wetherill,
James Armstrong,	John Kean,
George Ege,	Jonas Hartzell,
John Hubley,	Gabriel Hiester,
William Hall,	Presly Carr Lane,
Samuel W. Fisher,	Nathaniel B Borleau,
James Crawford, Sr.	Isaac Van Horne.
Robert Whitehill,	
DELAWARE.	
Kensey Johns,	Nathaniel Mitchell.
Samuel White,	
MARYLAND.	
Edmund Plowden.	Francis Deakins,
George Murdock,	John Gilpin,
Martin Kershner,	Perry Spencer,
Gabriel Duvall,	William M Robertson,
Nicholas B. Moore,	Littleton Dennis.
VIRGINIA.	
George Wythe,	Walter Jones,
William Newsum,	Richard Brent,
William H. Cabell,	William Ellzey,
James Madison, Jr.	John Brown,
John Page,	John Preston,
Thomas Newton,	Hugh Holmes,
Joseph Jones,	Archibald Stuart,
William B. Giles,	John Shore,
Creed Taylor,	John Bowyer,
Thomas Reade, Sr.	Daniel Coleman.
George Penn,	
KENTUCKY.	
John Coburn,	Charles Scott,
John Pope,	Isaac Shelby.
NORTH CAROLINA.	
William Tate,	Thomas Brown
Joseph Winston	William Martin
Absalom Tatom	Bryan Whitfield
Spruce Macay	Nathan Mayo
Joseph Taylor	Thomas Wynns
Gideon Alston	John Hamilton.
TENNESSEE.	
Daniel Smith	Robert Love.
John Locke	
SOUTH CAROLINA.	
John Hunter	Arthur Simkins
Paul Hamilton	Andrew Love
Robert Anderson	Joseph Blyth
Theodore Gaillard	Wade Hampton.
GEORGIA	
John Morrison	Henry Graybill
Dennis Smelt	David Blackshear.

FIFTH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

1805.—In 1804 THOMAS JEFFERSON was elected President of the United States, and GEORGE CLINTON Vice President, for four years from the 4th of March, 1805, by the following vote:

Number of votes to which each State is entitled.	STATES.	*For President.* Thomas Jefferson.	Charles Cotesworth Pinkney.	*For Vice President.* George Clinton.	Rufus King.
7	New Hampshire,	7	.	7	.
19	Massachusetts,	19	.	19	.
4	Rhode Island,	4	.	4	.
9	Connecticut,	.	9	.	9
6	Vermont,	6	.	6	.
19	New York,	19	.	19	.
8	New Jersey,	8	.	8	.
20	Pennsylvania,	20	.	20	.
3	Delaware,	.	3	.	3
11	Maryland,	9	2	9	2
24	Virginia,	24	.	24	.
14	North Carolina,	14	.	14	.
10	South Carolina,	10	.	10	.
6	Georgia,	6	.	6	.
5	Tennessee,	5	.	5	.
8	Kentucky,	8	.	8	.
3	Ohio,	3	.	3	.
176		162	14	162	14

Names of Electors of President and Vice President of the United States for the fifth election, for four years from the 4th March, 1805

THOMAS JEFFERSON, President,
GEORGE CLINTON, Vice President.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

John Goddard	Robert Alcock
Levi Bartlett	George Aldrich
Timothy Walker	William Tarlton.
Jonathan Steele	

MASSACHUSETTS.

James Sullivan	Timothy Newell
Elbridge Gerry	John Whiting
James Bowdoin	John Bacon
John Huthorne	William Heath
Thomas Kitteridge	John Woodman
James Winthrop	Charles Turner
Edward Upham	Thomas Fillebrown
James Warren	John Farley
John Davis	Jonathan Smith.
Josiah Deane	

RHODE ISLAND.

Constant Taber	James Helme
James Aldrich	Benjamin Remington.

CONNECTICUT.

Jonathan Trumbull	Lewis B. Sturges
John Treadwell	David Smith
Oliver Ellsworth	Asher Miller
David Daggett	Sylvester Gilbert.
Joshua Huntington	

VERMONT.

Josiah Wright	Nathaniel Niles
Samuel Shaw	William Hunter
Ezra Butler	John Noyes.

NEW YORK.

Sylvester Dering	John Cramer
James Fairlie	Thomas Brooks
Cornelius Bergen	Matthias B. Hildreth
John Herring	William Floyd
Ezra Thompson	Jonas Earl
John Wood	Joseph Ellicott
Conrad I. Elmendorff	Henry Quackinboss
Stephen Miller	Adam Comstock
Albert Pawling	Abraham Bancker.
Isaac Sargent	

NEW JERSEY.

Solomon Freligh	Thomas Newbold
Alexander Carmichael	Moore Furman
Phineas Manning	Jacob Hufty
William Rossell	Abijah Smith.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Charles Thompson	Casper Shaffner, Jr.
William Montgomery	John Bowman
Matthew Lawler	William Brown
Robert McMullen	George Smith
William Brooke	Jacob Hostetter
Thomas Long	Jacob Bonnett
Francis Swaine	James Montgomery
Henry Spering	John Minor
James Boyd	John Hamilton
Peter Frailey	Nathaniel Irish

DELAWARE.

Maxwell Bines	Thomas Fisher.
George Kennard	

MARYLAND.

John Parnham	Tobias E. Stansbury
Joseph Wilkinson	John Gilpin
John Johnson	William Gleaves
Edward Johnson	Perry Spencer
John Tyler	Ephraim K. Wilson.
Frisby Tilghman	

VIRGINIA.

Richard Evers Lee	Richard Field
John Goodrich	Thomas Read
Edward Pegram	Creed Taylor
William H. Cabell	John Taliaferro, Jr.
George Penn	Richard Brent
George Wythe	Hugh Holmes
John Taylor	James Dailey
Larkin Smith	James Allen
John Minor	Archibald Stuart
William Ellzy	James McFarlane
William Dudley	John Preston
Mann Page	William McKinley.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Felix Walker	Robert Cochran
Peter Forney	Lemuel Sawyer
Joseph Williams	James Jones
Montford Stokes	Reading Blount
Solomon Graves	Bryan Whitfield
Joseph Taylor	Samuel Ashe, Sen.
Joseph John Alston	Gideon Alston.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

John Blake	Samuel Warren
John Gaillard	Arthur Simkins
Thomas Taylor	William Hill
Joseph Blythe	James Miles
Joseph Calhoun	John Taylor.

GEORGIA.

Edward Telfair	James B. Maxwell
David Emanuel	John Rutherford
Henry Graybill	David Cresswell.

TENNESSEE.

David Deaderick	William Martin
Richard Mitchell	George Ridley.
Robert Houston	

KENTUCKY.

Charles Scott	Isaac Shelby
John Coburn	Ninian Edwards
Hubbard Taylor	Joseph Lewis
William Irvine	William Roberts.

OHIO.

William Goforth	James Pritchard.
Nathaniel Massie	

SIXTH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

1809.—In 1808 JAMES MADISON was elected President of the United States, and GEORGE CLINTON Vice President for four years from the 4th of March, 1809, by the following vote:

Number of votes to which each State is entitled.	STATES.	For President. James Madison.	George Clinton.	C. C. Pinkney.	For Vice President. George Clinton.	James Madison.	James Monroe.	John Langdon.	Rufus King.
7	New Hampshire,	.	.	7	.	.	.	.	7
19	Massachusetts,	.	.	19	.	.	.	.	19
4	Rhode Island,	.	.	4	.	.	.	.	4
9	Connecticut,	.	.	9	.	.	.	.	9
6	Vermont,	6	.	.	.	.	.	6	.
19	New York,	13	6	.	13	3	3	.	.
8	New Jersey,	8	.	.	8	.	.	.	.
20	Pennsylvania,	20	.	.	20	.	.	.	.
3	Delaware,	.	.	3	.	.	.	.	.
11	Maryland,	9	.	2	9	.	.	.	.
24	Virginia,	24	.	.	24	.	.	.	.
14	North Carolina,	11	.	3	11	.	.	.	3
10	South Carolina,	10	.	.	10	.	.	.	.
6	Georgia,	6	.	.	6	.	.	.	.
7	Kentucky,	7	.	.	7	.	.	.	.
5	Tennessee,	5	.	.	5	.	.	.	.
3	Ohio,	3	.	.	.	.	.	3	.
175		122	6	47	113	3	3	9	47

Names of Electors of President and Vice President of the United States for the sixth election, for four years from 4th March, 1809.

JAMES MADISON, President.
GEORGE CLINTON, Vice President.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Jeremiah Smith	Timothy Farrar
Oliver Peabody	Benjamin West
Samuel Hale	Jonathan Franklin
Robert Wallace	

MASSACHUSETTS.

Caleb Strong	Daniel Dewey
Francis Dana	Ebenezer Warren
John Brooks	Samuel Tobey
Moses Broun	Joshua Thomas
William Bartlett	Lemuel Williams
Ebenezer Bridge	Andrew Fernald
Benjamin Heywood	Samuel Freeman
Josiah Stearns	Samuel S. Wilde
John Hooker	Jeremiah Bailey.
John Barrett	

RHODE ISLAND.

Thomas P. Ives	James Rhodes
Christopher Fowler	Thomas Noyes.

CONNECTICUT.

Jonathan Trumbull	John Cotton Smith
John Treadwell	Stephen T. Hosmer
David Daggett	Jesse Root
Roger Griswold	Frederick Wolcott
Samuel W. Johnson	

VERMONT.

Israel Smith	Samuel Shepardson
Jonas Galusha	James Tarbox
John White	William Cahoon.

NEW YORK

Ambrose Spencer	Henry Yates, Jr.
Henry Huntington	Benjamin Mooers
John W. Seaman	Adam B. Vroman
Henry Rutgers	Thomas Shankland
John Garretson	William Hallock
Ebenezer White	Russel Atwater
Thomas Lawrence	Joseph Simonds
James Tallmadge	Hugh Jamison
Jonathan Rouse	Matthew Carpenter.
Micajah Pettit	

NEW JERSEY.

James Mott	Benjamin Egbert
James Morgan	Thomas Hendry
Amos Harrison	George Borgin
David Welsh	Abijah Smith.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Charles Thomson	Adamson Tannehill
Thomas Leiper	James Cowden
Michael Leib	William Wilson
Joseph Engle	Robert Griffen
William Rodman	Jacob Hostetter
Archibald Darrah	David Fullerton
Jacob Weygandt	Peter Kimmell
Joseph Lefevre	Joseph Huston
Gabriel Hiester, Jr.	William Montgomery
George Hartman	John McDowell.

DELAWARE.

James Booth	Daniel Rodney.
Nicholas Ridgely	

MARYLAND.

John R. Plater	Tobias E. Stansbury
Robert Bowie	Thomas W. Veazey
Edward Johnson	Richard Tilghman
John Johnson	Earle Perry Spencer
John Tyler	Henry James Carroll.
Nathaniel Rochester	

VIRGINIA.

Joseph Godwin, Sen.	Benjamin Harrison
Edward Pegram, Sen.	Robert Nelson
Richard Field	Mann Page
Thomas Read	Richard Barnes
Joseph Eggleston	John T. Brooke
Hugh Nelson	Hugh Holmes
George Penn	Osborne Sprigg
Philip N. Nicholas	James Allen
Spencer Roane	Archibald Stuart
John Roane	Andrew Russell
Robert Taylor	John Preston
Gustavus B. Horner	William McKinley.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Francis Locke	Robert Cleveland
Thomas Wynns	Kemp Plummer
Samuel Ashe, Sen.	Joseph Taylor
Murdock McKenzie	Peter Forney
Robert Love	James Rainey
John Winslow	Joseph Riddick
William Gaston	Henry L. Toole.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Joseph Gist	Joseph Bellinger
John Wilson	Langdon Cheves
John McMonies	Paul Hamilton
William Strother	Samuel Mays
William Zimmerman	William Rouse.

GEORGIA.

John Rutherford	David Meriwether
John Twiggs	Christopher Clark
Henry Graybill	James E. Houstoun

KENTUCKY

Samuel Hopkins	Charles Scott
William Logan	Robert Trimble
Matthew Walton	Hubbard Taylor
Robert Ewing	Christopher Greenup

TENNESSEE

James Robertson	Joseph Greer
William Martin	James Sevier.
Baldwin Harle	

OHIO.

Nathaniel Massie	Thomas McCune.
Stephen Wood	

SEVENTH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

1813.—In 1812 JAMES MADISON was re-elected Pres dent, and ELBRIDGE GERRY was elected Vice President of the United States, for 4 years from 4th March, 1813, as folows

Number of votes to which each State is entitled.	STATES.	For Pres.dent. James Madison.	For Pres.dent. DeWitt Clinton	For Vice President Elbridge Gerry.	For Vice President [illegible]
8	New Hampshire,	.	8	1	
22	Massachusetts,	.	22	22	2
4	Rhode Island,	.	4	.	
9	Connecticut,	.	9	.	
8	Vermont,	8	.	8	
29	New York,	.	29	.	2
8	New Jersey,	.	8	.	
25	Pennsylvania,	25	.	25	
4	Delaware,	.	4	.	
11	Maryland,	6	5	6	
25	Virginia,	25	.	25	
15	North Carolina,	15	.	15	
11	South Carolina,	11	.	11	
8	Georgia,	8	.	8	
12	Kentucky,	12	.	12	
8	Tennessee,	8	.	8	
7	Ohio,	7	.	7	
3	Louisiana,	3	.	3	
217		128	89	131	8

Names of the Electors of President and Vice President of the United States, for the seventh election from the 4th of March, 1813.

JAMES MADISON, President.
ELBRIDGE GERRY, Vice President.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

John Goddard	Timothy Farrar
Oliver Peabody	Benjamin West
Samuel Hale	Caleb Ellis
Nathan Taylor	Jonathan Franklin.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William Heath	John W. Hulbert
Harrison G. Otis	Joshua Thomas
Nathan Dane	David Scudder
Jeremiah Nelson	Lathrop Lewis
Abraham Bigloe	Nathaniel Goodwin
John Walker	Samuel Parris
George Bliss	Abiel Wood
Benjamin Heywood	Lemuel Paine
Eleazer James	James McLellan
Ephraim Williams	William Crosby
Isaac Maltby	Israel Thorndike.

RHODE ISLAND.

Christopher Fowler	William Rhodes
Samuel G. Arnold	Ephraim Bowen.

CONNECTICUT.

Nathaniel Terry	Daniel Putnam
Theodore Dwight	James Gould
David Daggett	Stephen T. Hosmer
Calvin Goddard	Jonathan Barnes.
Samuel B. Sherwood	

VERMONT.

Nathaniel Niles	Josiah Wright
Noah Chittenden	William A. Griswold
William Slade	Elihu Luce
John H. Andrus	Mark Richards.

NEW YORK.

Joseph C. Yates	David Van Ness
Simeon De Witt	Robert Jenkins
Archibald McIntyre	M. S. Van Deicook
John C. Hogeboom	George Palmer, Jr.
Gurdon S. Mumford	James Hill
Jacob Delamontagnie	William Kirby
Philip Van Cortlandt	Henry Frey
John Chandler	Thomas H. Hubbard
Henry Huntington	John Russell
John Woodworth	James S. Kipp
David Boyd	Jotham Jayne
Cornelius Bergen	Jonathan Stanley, Jr.
Joseph Perine	William Burnet
Chauncey Belknap	George Rosecrantz
John Dill	

NEW JERSEY.

Matthew Whildden	William Griffeth
William B. Ewing	Elias Conover
Franklin Davenport	Andrew Howell
Jacob Losey	William Mcdill

PENNSYLVANIA

Walter Franklin	Hugh Glasgow
David Mitchell	David Fullerton
Paul Cox	Samuel Smyth
Isaac Worrell	Robert Smith
Michael Baker	Nathaniel Meckler
Joseph Engle	Charles Shoemaker, Jr.
James Fulton	James Mitchell
Isaiah Davis	John Murray
John Whitehill	Clement Paine
Edward Crouch	Joseph Reed
Henry Allshouse	Alexander Dysart
James Stephenson	David Mead.
Abia Minor	

DELAWARE.

James L. Clayton	James Sykes
Benjamin Blackiston	Thomas Fisher.

MARYLAND.

Henry H. Chapman	Tobias E. Stansbury
Edward H. Calvert	Thomas W. Veazey
Edward Johnson	Thomas Worrell
John Stephen	Edward Lloyd
Henry Williams	Littleton Dennis.
Daniel Reutch	

VIRGINIA.

Richard Henry Lee	Gustavus B. Horner
Benjamin Harrison	Robert Nelson
Edward Pegram	Mann Page
Richard Field	Walter Jones
Thomas Read	John T. Brooke
Mathew Cheatham	Hugh Holmes
William Armistead	Daniel Morgan
Charles Yancey	Archibald Rutherford
George Penn	Archibald Stuart
William G. Poindexter	Andrew Russell
Spencer Roane	Charles Taylor
Sthreshly Reynolds	William McKinley.
Robert Taylor	

NORTH CAROLINA.

William H. Murfree	James Mebane
Redar Ballard	James Rainey
James Bright	Francis Locke
Thomas D. King	Montfort Stokes
James W. Clarke	Joseph Winston
Hutchens G. Burton	Jonathan Hampton
Thomas Davis	Henry Massey.
Kemp Plummer	

SOUTH CAROLINA

James Campbell	Reuben Starke
John Johnson	John McCreary
Andrew Pickens	William Smith
William Caldwell	William Alston
Samuel Johnson	Richard Singleton.
Sampson Butler	

GEORGIA.

Daniel Stewart	John Twiggs
Henry Graybill	Oliver Porter
Charles Harris	Henry Mitchell
John Rutherford	John Howard

KENTUCKY.

Robert Ewing	William Irvine
William Casey	Robert Mosby
Samuel Morrell	Hubbard Taylor
Samuel Caldwell	Duval Payne
Richard Taylor	Walker Baylor
William Logan	Thomas D. Owings.

TENNESSEE.

E. R. Dalany	William Trigg
Henry Bradford	Thomas Washington
James Trimble	David McEwen
James McCampbell	Thomas Johnson.

OHIO.

John Jones	David Abbott*
Matthias Corwin	Thomas Ijams
David Purviance	John Hamm.
James Dunlap	
James Pritchard	

* Not present.

LOUISIANA.

Julien Poydras	Stephen A. Hopkins
Philemon Thomas	

EIGHTH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

1817.—In 1816 James Monroe was elected President, and Daniel D. Tompkins, Vice President of the United States for four years from the 4th of March, 1817, as follows:

Number of votes to which each State is entitled.	STATES.	For President.		For Vice President.				
		James Monroe.	Rufus King.	Daniel D. Tompkins.	John E. Howard.	James Ross.	John Marshall.	Robert G. Harper.
8	N. Hampshire,	8	.	8	.	.	.	.
22	Massachusetts,	.	22	.	22	.	.	.
4	Rhode Island,	4	.	4	.	.	.	.
9	Connecticut,	.	9	.	.	5	4	.
8	Vermont, -	8	.	8	.	.	.	.
29	New York,	29	.	29	.	.	.	.
8	New Jersey,	8	.	8	.	.	.	.
25	Pennsylvania,	25	.	25	.	.	.	.
3	Delaware, -	.	3	.	.	.	.	3
8	Maryland, -	8	.	8	.	.	.	.
25	Virginia, -	25	.	25	.	.	.	.
15	N. Carolina,	15	.	15	.	.	.	.
11	S. Carolina,	11	.	11	.	.	.	.
8	Georgia, -	8	.	8	.	.	.	.
12	Kentucky, -	12	.	12	.	.	.	.
8	Tennessee, -	8	.	8	.	.	.	.
8	Ohio, - -	8	.	8	.	.	.	.
3	Louisiana, -	3	.	3	.	.	.	.
3	Indiana, -	3	.	3	.	.	.	.
217		183	34	183	22	5	4	3

Names of Electors of President and Vice President of the United States, for the eighth election for four years, from 4th March, 1817.

JAMES MONROE, President.
DANIEL D. TOMPKINS, Vice President.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Thomas Manning	Richard H. Ayer
Benjamin Butler	Jacob Tuttle
William Badger	Thomas C. Drew
Amos Cogswell	Dan Young.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Christopher Gore	Bezaleel Taft
Prentiss Mellan	Jonas Kendall
Israel Thorndike	Edward H. Robbins
Benjamin Pickman, Jr.	John Low
Daniel A. White	Steph. Longfellow, Jr.
Joseph Locke	William Abbot
Thomas Dwight	Timothy Routelle
Peter Bryant	Luther Carey
Daniel Howard	William Phillips
Wendell Davis	Josiah Stebbins
Seth Washburn	Thomas H. Perkins.

RHODE ISLAND.

James Fenner	Edward Willcox
Thomas Pitman	Dutee Arnold.

CONNECTICUT.

Jonathan Ingersoll	William Perkins
Nathaniel Terry	Elisha Sterling
Seth P. Staples	Elijah Hubbard
Jirah Isham	Asa Willey.
Samuel W. Johnson	

VERMONT.

Jonathan Robinson	James Roberts
Apollas Austin	Asaph Fletcher
Robert Holly	John H. Cotton
William Brayton	Isaiah Fisk.

NEW YORK.

Henry Rutgers	Alexander McNish
Lemuel Chipman	Artemas Aldrich
John W. Seaman	Henry Becker
Jacob Drake	Aaron Haring
James Fairlie	Israel W Clark
Augustus Wright	Daniel Root
Peter S Van Orden	Montgomery Hunt
T. W. Van Wyck	Nicholl Fosdick
Joseph D Monell	Eliphalet Edmonds
John Blake, Jr.	George Petit
Jacob Wertz	Richard Townley
Gabriel North	Samuel Lawrence
Charles E Dudley	Nathaniel Rochester
Benjamin Smith	Worthy L Churchel.
Samuel Lewis	

NEW JERSEY.

Lewis Moore	Charles Ogden
Aaron Kitchell	Daniel Garrison
David Welsh	William Rossell
John Crowell	Robert McNeely.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Paul Cox	Michael Fackenthal
David Mitchell	James Wilson
John Geyer	Gabriel Heister
Daniel Bussier	James Meloy
John Conard	James Banks
William Brooke	Robert Clark
Isaac Anderson	Abiel Fellows
Matthew Roberts	David Marchand
John Mohlar	Thomas Patterson
John Harrison	Joseph Huston
Jacob Hostetter	Samuel Scott
John Rea	James Alexander.
William Gilliland	

DELAWARE.

Thomas Robinson	Andrew Barratt
Isaac Tunnell	Nicholas Ridgely.

MARYLAND.

William Dent Beall	George Warner
Joseph Kent	William C. Miller
Edward Johnson	Benjamin Massy
John Stephen	Thomas Ennalls
John Buchanan	Littleton Dennis.
Lawrence Brengle	

VIRGINIA.

George Newton	John T. Brooke
Charles H. Graves	Hugh Holmes
John Pegram	Archibald Rutherford
John Purnall	Archibald Stuart
Joseph C. Cabell	Andrew Russell
Charles Yancey	Charles Taylor
Spencer Roane	Robert B. Starke
Sthreshly Reynolds	William Archer
Robert Taylor	Benjamin Cook
Isaac Foster	Wm. Brockenbrough
Brazure W Pryor	Daniel Morgan
William Jones	John Edie.
William Lee Ball	

NORTH CAROLINA.

Robert Love	Nathaniel Jones
Jesse Franklin	John Hall
Peter Forney	Thomas Wynns
Francis Locke	Joseph Riddick
Abraham Phillips	James Hoskins
Alexander Gray	Vine Allen
Joseph Pukett	Thomas D. King.
Thomas Ruffin	

SOUTH CAROLINA.

William Garrett	James Duff
Philemon Bradford	Thomas Evans

William McKeralls	Thomas Lee
Frederick Nance	John L. Wilson
John Thomas	Joseph Reid.
Richard B. Screven	

GEORGIA.

David Adams	Charles Harris
John McIntosh	John Clark
Jared Irwin	John Rutherford
Henry Mitchell	David Meriwether.

KENTUCKY.

Duvall Payne	Richard Taylor
Hubbard Taylor	William Logan
Robert Trimble	Alexander Adair
Thomas Bodley	Samuel Caldwell
Willis A. Lee	Samuel Murrel
William Irvine	Robert Ewing.

TENNESSEE.

Alfred M. Carter	Robert Allen
Joseph Hamilton	Martin McClanahan
David Campbell	Samuel Buchanan
Adam Huntsman	James Baxter.

OHIO.

John G. Young	Abraham Shepherd
Aaron Wheeler	Othniel Looker
John Patterson	Benjamin Haugh
William Skinner	James Curry.

LOUISIANA.

Garrigues Flaujac	Squire Lea.
John R. Grymes	

INDIANA.

Jesse L. Holman	Thomas H. Blake.
Joseph Bartholomew	

NINTH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

1821.—In 1820 JAMES MONROE was re-elected President, and DANIEL D. TOMPKINS Vice President of the United States, for four years from the 4th of March, 1821, by the following vote:

Number of votes to which each State is entitled.	STATES.	For President.		For Vice President.				
		James Monroe.	John Quincy Adams.	Daniel D. Tompkins.	Richard Stockton.	Robert G. Harper.	Richard Rush.	Daniel Rodney.
8	N. Hampshire,	7	1	7	.	.	1	
15	Massachusetts.	15	.	7	8			
4	Rhode Island,	4	.	4				
9	Connecticut,	9	.	9				
8	Vermont, -	8	.	8				
29	New York,	29	.	29				
8	New Jersey,	8	.	8				
25	Pennsylvania,	24	.	24				
4	Delaware, -	4	.	.	.	.	.	4
11	Maryland, -	11	.	10	.	1		
25	Virginia, -	25	.	25				
15	N. Carolina.	15	.	15				
11	S. Carolina,	11	.	11				
8	Georgia, -	8	.	8				
12	Kentucky, -	12	.	12				
8	Tennessee,	7	.	7				
8	Ohio, - -	8	.	8				
3	Louisiana, -	3	.	3				
3	Indiana, -	3	.	3				
3	Mississippi,	2	.	2				
3	Illinois, -	3	.	3				
3	Alabama, -	3	.	3				
9	Maine, -	9	.	9				
3	Missouri, -	3	.	3				
231		228	1	215	8	1	1	4

Names of Electors of President and Vice President of the United States, for the ninth election, for four years from the 4th of March, 1821.

JAMES MONROE, President.
DANIEL D. TOMPKINS, Vice President.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

William Plumer	John Pendexter
David Barker	Nathaniel Shannon
William Fisk	Ezra Bartlett
Samuel Dinsmoor	James Smith.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John Adams	Seth Sprague
William Phillips	Thomas H. Blood
William Gray	Jonas Sibley
Daniel Webster	Ezra Starkweather
B. W. Crowninshield	Wendell Davis
John Heard	John Davis
Samuel Dana	Joseph Woodbridge
Ebenezer Mattoon	

RHODE ISLAND.

James Fenner	Robert F. Noyes
Dutee J. Pearce	Dutee Arnold.

CONNECTICUT.

Henry Seymour	Isaiah Loomis
Samuel Welles	William Cogswell
William Moseley	John Alsop
Ebenezer Brockway	Ingoldsby W. Crawford.
Samuel H. Phillips	

VERMONT.

James Galusha	William Slade, Jr.
Gilbert Denison	Daniel A. A. Buck
Pliny Smith	Ezra Butler
Aaron Leland	Timothy Stanley.

NEW YORK.

William Floyd	John Baker
Henry Rutgers	John Wadworth
Abel Huntington	Daniel McDougall
Edward Severich	Seth Wetmore
Isaac Lawrence	Latham A. Burrows
John Targee	Ferrand Stranahan
Jacob Odell	Henry Wager
Peter Waring	Elisha Harnham
Edward P. Livingston	Jonathan Collins
Peter Millikin	Samuel Nelson
David Hammond	William B. Rochester
Mark Spencer	Charles Thompson
Benjamin Knower	Philetus Swift
Gilbert Eddy	James Brisban.
Howell Gardner	

NEW JERSEY.

David Mills	Samuel L. Southard
John Wilson	Joseph Budd
John Crowell	Isaiah Shinn
Aaron Vansychel	John L. Smith.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Thomas Leiper	James P. Sanderson
Paul Cox	William Clinghan
Daniel Groves	George Barnitz
Chandler Price	James Griffen
Pierce Crosby	John Miley
Andrew Gilkerson	George Plumer
John Hamilton	George Hebb
James Kerr	Andrew Sutton
William Mitchell	Joseph Huston
Daniel W. Dingman	Hugh Davis
Gabriel Hiester, Sen.	Patrick Farrelly
John Todd	Melchior Rahm—(deceased.)
Philip Benner	

DELAWARE.

Peter Robinson	Nicholas Ridgely
John Clark	Andrew Barratt.

MARYLAND.

James Forrest	Elias Brown
Robert W. Bowie	John Forward
John Stephen	William R. Stuart
Alexander McKim	John Boon
William Gabby	Joshua Prideaux.
Michael C Sprigg	

VIRGINIA.

William C. Holt	Thomas Brown
Charles H. Graves	Robert Shields
John Pegram	William Jones
Robert B. Stark	John Taliaferro
John Purnall	John T. Brook
Branch T. Archer	Hugh Holmes
William C. Rives	Wm. Armstrong, Jr.
Charles Yancey	Archibald Rutherford
Joseph Martin	Archibald Stuart
Wm. Brockenbrough	Andrew Russell
Armistead Hoomes	Samuel Blackburn
James Hunter	John Edie.
Robert Taylor	

NORTH CAROLINA.

Robert Love	Kimborough Jones
Jesse Franklin	John Hall
Michael McLeary	George Outlaw
Francis Locke	Charles E. Johnson
Abraham Phillips	Lewis D. Wilson
Alexander Gray	Henry J. G. Ruffin
Benj. H. Covington	Thomas Kenan.
James Mebane	

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Benjamin James	Benjamin Rynalds
Lewis M. Ayer	Isaac Smith
John S. Glascock	John Dunovant
Matthew J. Kirth	Rasha Cannon
Benjamin Dickson	William A. Ball.
Charles Miller	

GEORGIA.

Oliver Porter	John Graves
Henry Mitchell	John Rutherford
John McIntosh	John Foster
David Meriwether	Benjamin Whitaker.

KENTUCKY.

Samuel Murrel	Martin D. Hardin
Ephraim M. Ewing	Willis A Lee
Samuel Caldwell	James Johnson
John E. King	Jesse Bledsoe
John Pope	Thomas Bodley
Richard Taylor	Hubbard Taylor.

TENNESSEE.

Alfred M. Carter	Joseph Dickson
Joseph Hamilton, Sr.	German Lester
David Campbell	Henry Small.
John J. White	

OHIO.

Jeremiah Morrow	James Caldwell
William H. Harrison	James Kilbourne
Alexander Campbell	John McLaughlin
Robert Lucas	Lewis Dille.

LOUISIANA.

Philemon Thomas	John R. Grymes.
David L. Todd	

INDIANA.

Nathaniel Ewing	John H. Thompson.
Daniel J. Caswell	

MISSISSIPPI.

Duncan Stewart	Daniel Burnet.
Theodore Stark	

ILLINOIS.

James B. Moore	Adolphus Frederick
Michael Jones	Hubbard.

ALABAMA.

John Scott	George Phillips.
Henry Minor	

MAINE.

William Moody	Lemuel Trescott
Joshua Wingate, Jr.	Joshua Gage
Elisha Allen	Josiah Prescott
William Chadwick	Levi Hubbard.
Samuel Tucker	

MISSOURI.

William Shannon	John S. Brickey.
William Christy	

TENTH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

1825.—In 1824 there were four candidates for the Presidency before the people, viz. ANDREW JACKSON of Tennessee. WILLIAM H. CRAWFORD of Georgia, JOHN QUINCY ADAMS of Massachusetts, and HENRY CLAY of Kentucky; and the Electoral College having elected JOHN C. CALHOUN of South Carolina, as Vice President, and having failed to elect a President, the choice devolved on the House of Representatives, who elected JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

The votes in the Electoral College from which no choice resulted, is as follows:

Number of votes to which each State is entitled.	STATES.	For President. Andrew Jackson.	John Quincy Adams.	Wm. H. Crawford.	Henry Clay.	For Vice President. John C. Calhoun.	Nathan Sanford.	Nathaniel Macon.	Andrew Jackson.	Martin Van Buren.	Henry Clay.
8	New Hampshire,	.	7	.	.	7	.	.	1	.	.
15	Massachusetts,	.	15	.	.	15	.	.	.	.	.
4	Rhode Island,	.	4	.	.	3	.	.	.	.	.
8	Connecticut,	.	.	8	.	.	.	.	8	.	.
7	Vermont,	.	7	.	.	7	.	.	.	.	.
36	New York,	1	26	5	4	29	7	.	.	.	.
8	New Jersey,	8	.	.	.	8	.	.	.	.	.
28	Pennsylvania,	28	.	.	.	28	.	.	.	.	.
3	Delaware,	.	1	2	.	1	.	.	.	.	2
11	Maryland,	7	3	1	.	10	.	.	1	.	.
24	Virginia,	.	.	24	.	.	.	24	.	.	.
15	North Carolina,	15	.	.	.	15	.	.	.	.	.
11	South Carolina,	11	.	.	.	11	.	.	.	.	.
9	Georgia,	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	2	.
14	Kentucky,	.	.	.	14	.	7	.	.	.	.
11	Tennessee,	11	.	.	.	11	.	.	.	.	.
16	Ohio.	.	.	.	16	.	16	.	.	.	.
5	Louisiana,	3	2	.	.	5	.	.	.	.	.
5	Indiana,	5	.	.	.	5	.	.	.	.	.
3	Mississippi,	3	.	.	.	3	.	.	.	.	.
3	Illinois,	2	1	.	.	3	.	.	.	.	.
5	Alabama,	5	.	.	.	5	.	.	.	.	.
9	Maine,	.	9	.	.	9	.	.	.	.	.
3	Missouri,	.	.	.	3	.	.	.	3	.	.
261		99	84	41	37	182	30	24	13	9	2

The following is the vote in the House of Representatives:

For John Quincy Adams.
Maine,
New Hampshire,
Massachusetts,
Rhode Island,
Connecticut,
Vermont,
New York,
Maryland,
Ohio,
Kentucky,
Illinois,
Missouri,
Louisiana—13.

For Andrew Jackson.
New Jersey,
Pennsylvania,
South Carolina,
Tennessee,
Alabama,
Mississippi,
Indiana—7.

For William H. Crawford.
Delaware,
Virginia,
North Carolina,
Georgia—4.

Names of Electors of President and Vice President of the United States, for the tenth election, for four years from the 4th March, 1825.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, President.
JOHN C. CALHOUN, Vice President

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Josiah Bartlett	Abel Parker
William Badger	Caleb Keith
Samuel Quarles	Moses White
William Fisk	Hall Burgin.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William Gray	Oliver Smith
Levi Lincoln	Enos Foot
Thomas L. Winthrop	William Walker
Natbaniel Silsbee	John Endicot
Joseph Kettredge	Thomas Weston
Augustus Tower	Cornelius Grinnell
Jonathan Davis	Hezekiah Barnard.
Edmund Cushing	

RHODE ISLAND.

Caleb Earle	Elisha Watson
Stephen B. Cornell	Charles Eldridge.

CONNECTICUT.

Calvin Willey	David Keyes
Oliver Wolcott	John Swathel
Rufus Hitchcock	Lemuel White
David Hill	Moses Warren.

VERMONT.

Jonas Galusha	John Mason
Titus Hutchinson	Dan Carpenter
Joseph Burr	Asa Aldis.
Jabez Procter	

NEW YORK.

Nathan Thompson	William Townsend
Darius Bentley	Thomas Lawyer
Micah Brooks	Edward B Craudale
Pierre A. Barker	Samuel Hicks
Joseph Sibley	Edward Savage
Timothy H Porter	Benjamin Mooers
Samuel Russell	Chester Patterson
Marinus Willett	Phineas Coon
Ebenezer Sage	Azariah Smith
Richard Blauvelt	Eleazer Burnham
Abraham Stagg	Solomon St. John
John Drake	Elisha B. Strong
James Drake	Clark Crandall
Isaac Sutherland	Isaac Sutherland
William Walsh	John Lansing, Jr.
Alexander J. Coffin	Benjamin Bailey
Benjamin Smith	Samuel Smith
Elisha Dorr	Heman Cady.

NEW JERSEY.

Peter Wilson	John Buck
Daniel Vliet	James Cook
Jacob Kline	James Parker
Joseph Kille	Joseph W. Scott

PENNSYLVANIA.

Thomas Leiper	William Beatty
Cromwell Pearce	Valentine Giesey
Philip Peltz	John Reed
Alexander M'Caraher	James Duncan
Daniel Sheffer	John Boyd
Daniel Raub	Abraham Addams
Joseph Engle	Isaac Smith
John Pugh	William Thomson
Adam Ritscher	Asa Mann
Charles Kenny	John Fogel
Adam King	Philip Benner
John Rush	Henry Scheetz
Peter Adams	Adam Light
James Ankrim	James Murry.

DELAWARE.

John Caldwell	Isaac Tunnell.
Joseph G. Rowland	

MARYLAND

Henry Brawner	William Brown
John C. Herbert	Thomas Hope
George Winchester	Samuel G Osborn
Dennis Claude	James Sangston
William Tyler	Littleton Dennis.
Thomas Post	

VIRGINIA.

William C. Holt	Robert Shield
Charles H. Graves	Ellison Curric
John Cargill	Robert Taylor
William H. Brodnax	Isaac Foster
Joseph Wyatt	Daniel Morgan
James Jones	William Armstrong
Charles Yancey	Archibald Rutherford
Joseph Martin	John Bowyer
Thomas M. Randolph	James Hoge
Wm. Brockenbrough	Andrew Russell
John T. Somax	Joseph H Samuels
William Jones	William Marteney.

NORTH CAROLINA

Montfort Stokes	William Martin
Robert Love	William A Blount
Peter Forney	William B. Lockhart
Vine Allen	Edward B. Dudley
James Mebane	Augusta H. Shepperd
John Giles	Walter J Leake
William Drew	John M. Morehead.
Josiah Crudup	

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Robert Clendinen	Evan Benbow
John K Griffin	William Garrett
Angus Patterson	Eldred Simkins
Joseph W. Alston	William C. Pinckney
Matthew J. Keith	Thomas Benson.
William Laval	

GEORGIA

Elias Beall	William Matthews
Thomas Cumming	John McIntosh
John Floyd	John Rutherford
John Harden	William Terrell.
Warren Jourdan	

KENTUCKY.

Joseph R. Underwood	Richard Taylor
John E. King	Joseph Allen
Alney McLean	W. Moore
Young Ewing	Thomas Bodley
Benjamin Lecher	D. Payne
James Smiley	J. J. Crittenden
Joshua Fry	H. Taylor.

TENNESSEE.

John Rhea	William A Sublett
T. A. Howard	Joseph Brown
Wm. E. Anderson	Joel Pinson
B C. Stout	Willie Blout
William Mitchell	Robert H Dyer
Samuel Hogg	

OHIO.

William H. Harrison	James Caldwell
William McFarland	David Sloane
Thomas Kirker	Samuel Coulter
James Heaton	Solomon Kingsberry
Henry Brown	Ebenezer Merry
Ebenezer Buckingham	James Cooley
William Kendall	James Steele
William Skinner	John Bigger

LOUISIANA.

William Nott, John B. Plauche
James H. Shepherd, S. Hiriart.
Pierre Lacoste

INDIANA.

Elias McNamee, John Carr
David Robb, Jonathan McCarty.
Samuel Milroy

MISSISSIPPI

Thomas Hinds, Bartlett C. Barry.
James Patton

ILLINOIS.

William Harrison, Alexander P. Field.
Henry Eddy

ALABAMA.

Reuben Saffold, James Hill
Henry Chambers, John Murphy.
William Fleming

MAINE.

James Campbell, Lemuel Trescott
Thomas Fillebrown, James Parker
Nathaniel Hobbs, Benjamin Chandler
Rev. Joshua Taylor, Benjamin Nourse.
Stephen Parsons

MISSOURI.

David Todd, James Logan.
David Musick

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

The following statement exhibits the manner of choosing Electors for President and Vice President in the several States, the time at which each election is held, and the number of Electors to which each State is entitled:

STATES.	MODE.	No. of Electors.	TIME OF ELECTION.
Maine. . .	District.	9	November 3d.
New Hampshire,	Gen. ticket,	8	November 3d.
Massachusetts,	Gen. ticket,	15	November 3d.
Rhode Island, .	Gen. ticket,	4	November 19th.
Connecticut, .	Gen. ticket,	8	November 3d.
Vermont, . .	Gen. ticket,	7	November 11th.
New York, .	District,	36	November 3, 4, 5.
New Jersey, .	Gen. ticket,	8	November 4 & 5.
Pennsylvania, .	Gen. ticket,	28	October 31st.
Delaware, .	Legislature,	3	By Legislature.
Maryland, .	District,	11	November 10th.
Virginia, . .	Gen. ticket,	24	November 3d.
North Carolina,	Gen. ticket,	15	November 13th.
South Carolina,	Legislature,	11	By Legislature.
Geo. gia, . .	Gen. ticket,	9	November 3d.
Tennessee, .	District,	11	November 13& 14.
Kentucky, .	Gen. ticket,	14	November 10th.
Ohio, . .	Gen. ticket,	16	October 31st.
Indiana, . .	Gen. ticket,	5	November 10th.
Illinois. . .	Gen. ticket,	3	November 3d.
Missouri, . .	Gen. ticket,	3	November 3d.
Louisiana, .	Gen. ticket,	5	November 3, 4, 5.
Mississippi, .	Gen. ticket,	3	November 3d.
Alabama, . .	Gen. ticket,	5	November 10th.
	Total	261	

From the foregoing statement it will be seen that eighteen States choose their Electors by General Ticket, four States by Districts, and two States by the Legislature.

ELEVENTH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

1829.—In 1828 ANDREW JACKSON was elected President, and JOHN C. CALHOUN re-elected Vice President of the United States, for four years from the 4th March, 1829.

The following is a statement of the votes for President:

MAINE.

Districts.	*Jackson.*	*Adams.*	*Scat.*
York,	1865	3047	9
Cumberland,	4227	4043	2
Lincoln,	833	2111	5
Kennebec,	1057	3075	8
Oxford,	2903	3265	31
Hancock & Washington,	1235	2268	4
Somerset & Penobscot,	1807	2964	35
Total,	13,927	20,773	94

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Jackson.	*Adams.*	*Total.*
20,692	24,076	44,098

VERMONT.

OFFICIAL CANVASS.

Counties.	*Adams.*	*Jackson.*
Bennington,	1658	386
Windham,	2907	497
Rutland,	3502	671
Windsor,	4022	502
Addison,	2582	633
Orange,	1995	1203
Chittenden,	1825	1096
Caledonia,	1324	497
Washington,	1313	1129
Franklin,	1820	805
Orleans,	879	450
Essex,	264	198
Grand Isle,	266	138
Totals,	24,784	8,205

MASSACHUSETTS.

Jackson.	*Adams.*	*Total.*
6,019	29 836	35,855

RHODE ISLAND.

Jackson.	*Adams.*	*Total.*
695	2,548	3,243

CONNECTICUT.

Counties.	*Adams.*	*Jackson.*
Hartford,	1273	2577
New Haven,	2031	234
New London,	2042	908
Fairfield,	1785	384
Windham,	1255	256
Litchfield,	2222	505
Middlesex,	890	573
Tolland,	1027	515
Totals,	13,829	4,448

NEW YORK.

The following table exhibits the votes for Presidential Electors in the several districts in this State:

Districts.	*Jackson.*	*Adams.*
1 Queens and Suffolk,	3075	2347
2 Kings, Rockland & Rich'd,	2986	1966
3 New York,	15435	9638
4 Westchester and Putnam,	3788	3153
5 Dutchess,	4680	3263
6 Orange,	3798	2586
7 Ulster and Sullivan	1624	2[illegible]

8 Columbia,	5446	3642	Susquehanna,	1062	694	368	
9 Rensselaer,	4263	4650	Centre,	1998	453	1545	
10 Albany,	3924	4195	Clearfield,	393	211	182	
11 Greene and Delaware,	5331	3371	Mifflin,	1650	506	1144	
12 Schenectady & Schoharie,	3740	2584	Crawford,	1117	958	159	
13 Otsego,	4241	3900	Cambria,	314	94	220	
14 Oneida,	5136	5817	Mercer,	1603	738	865	
15 Herkimer,	3177	2516	Perry,	1060	241	819	
16 Montgomery,	3778	3982	Washington,	3893	1687	2196	
17 Saratoga,	2920	3545	Greene,	1498	452	1046	
18 Washington,	2658	4085	Fayette,	2945	1230	1715	
19 Clinton, Essex, &c.	4503	5042	Franklin,	2586	1915	671	
20 Jefferson, St. Lawrence, &c.	9081	9164	Armstrong,	1133	169	964	
21 Chenango and Broome,	4329	3116	Erie,	773	945		172
22 Madison and Cortland,	4136	4974	Beaver,	1152	1282		29
23 Onondaga,	4264	3796	Schuylkill,	863	220	643	
24 Cayuga,	4159	2416	Indiana & Jefferson,	926	245	681	
25 Tompkins and Tioga,	5427	3735	Somerset,	1347	238	1109	
26 Ontario, Seneca, &c.	7011	9119	Butler,	1068	610	458	
27 Monroe and Livingston,	4631	7079	Venango,	769	126	643	
28 Steuben, Alleghany, &c.	5347	4395	Pike,	549	74	475	
29 Genessee and Orleans,	3256	6823	Wayne,	541	320	211	
30 Erie, Niagara, &c.	3660	7983	Warren,	340	243	97	
			Tioga,	950	193	657	
	140,763	135,413	Potter and M'Kean,	175	108	67	
				101,652	50,848	51,569	765

Aggregate majority for the Jackson Electors, 5,350.

Majority for Andrew Jackson, 50,804.

NEW JERSEY.

OFFICIAL RETURNS FOR ELECTORS.

Adams.		*Jackson.*	
Frelinghuysen,	23758	M'Cullough,	21809
Leaming,	23757	M'Carter,	21951
White,	23626	Maxwell,	21950
Hoff,	23760	Conover,	21703
Ely,	23761	Townsend,	21947
Brown,	23760	Kille,	21946
Elmer,	23757	Godwin,	21951
Zabriskie,	23754	Shinn,	21951

PENNSYLVANIA.

OFFICIAL RETURNS.

Counties.	*No. of votes polled.* Jackson.	Adams.	*Majorities.* Jackson.	Adams.
City and county of Philadelphia,	12017	6200	5817	
Chester,	3835	3535	300	
Lancaster,	5186	3719	1467	
Delaware,	953	1164		211
Montgomery,	3341	2311	1030	
Berks,	4583	894	3689	
Bucks,	3297	3425		128
York,	3645	1864	1781	
Cumberland,	2113	898	1215	
D uphin,	1974	1140	834	
Lebanon,	1439	597	842	
Huntingdon,	1708	1144	564	
Northumberland,	1669	395	1374	
Lehigh,	2000	516	1484	
Adams,	1242	1461		219
Northampton,	3628	889	2739	
Alleghany,	3866	1666	2200	
Westmoreland,	3917	629	3288	
Bedford,	2260	780	1480	
Lycoming	1534	467	1067	
Columbia,	1869	562	1307	
Union,	1697	210	1528	
Bradford,	1553	910	643	
Luzerne,	1645	1435	210	

DELAWARE.

The Electors are chosen by the Legislature. The vote of this State was given to Mr. Adams.

MARYLAND.

We have placed all the returns from this State, except St. Mary's, which will not vary the general result, and the Jackson majority is 161 votes through the State.

	Jackson.	*Adams.*
Baltimore city,	4385	4012
Baltimore county,	2952	1505
Prince George's,	716	766
Montgomery,	168	1017
City of Annapolis,	158	152
Hartford,	1233	1076
Cecil,	1055	996
Queen Anne,	666	641
Kent,	502	539
Talbot,	558	790
Caroline,	572	672
Dorchester,	643	893
Somerset,	828	1176
Worcester,	1086	899
Anne Arundel,	1070	1219
Frederick,	2980	3291
Washington,	1626	1506
Calvert,	320	580
Charles,	571	735
Alleghany,	693	549
	23,175	23,014

VIRGINIA.

OFFICIAL RETURNS.

	Jackson Ticket.	Adams Ticket
Albemarle	478	124
Amelia	223	19
Amherst	206	115
Augusta	359	407
Accomack	216	240
Alleghany	102	15
Bath	[illegible]	[illegible]

Bedford	300	294
Brooke	315	135
Brunswick	218	61
Buckingham	437	42
Berkeley	196	334
Botetourt	396	73
Campbell	311	194
Caroline	302	99
Charles City	60	26
Charlotte	319	51
Chesterfield	366	102
Culpepper	517	119
Cabell	203	70
Cumberland	219	86
Dinwiddie	171	31
Elizabeth City	74	74
Essex	195	46
Fairfax	119	123
Fauquier	372	249
Fluvanna	269	2
Frederick	630	453
Franklin	471	96
Giles	292	40
Gloucester	148	34
Goochland	178	30
Greenbrier	139	255
Greensville	101	17
Grayson	289	73
Hampshire	317	292
Hanover	280	145
Henrico	220	120
Halifax	560	76
Hardy	95	114
Harrison	437	291
Henry	245	27
Isle of Wight	262	68
Jefferson	207	291
James City	83	21
Kanawha	167	129
King & Queen	182	82
King William	178	32
King George	42	83
Loudoun	229	525
Louisa	435	34
Lee	275	33
Lewis	164	181
Lunenburg	194	13
Matthews	113	45
Mason	173	129
Middlesex	102	38
Mecklenburg	461	28
Montgomery	412	40
Madison	259	17
Monongalia	366	156
Monroe	158	268
Morgan	75	62
Nansemond	234	221
Nelson	199	71
New Kent	96	77
Norfolk County	156	317
Northampton	90	29
Northumberland	130	121
Nicholas	116	72
Nottoway	208	2
Ohio	330	421
Orange	424	107
Pocahontas	94	50
Powhatan	158	26
Preston	228	91
Prince George	180	8
Prince William	117	69
Patrick	262	53
Pittsylvania	699	116
Pendleton	256	144
Prince Edward	323	8
Princess Anne	105	264
Richmond County	83	106
Rockbridge	363	236
Rockingham	631	121
Randolph	107	148
Russell	229	15
Shenandoah	990	47
Southampton	341	113
Spottsylvania	267	77
Stafford	106	110
Sussex	305	8
Scott	247	4
Surry	160	32
Tyler	124	106
Tazewell	304	3
Westmoreland	102	95
Warwick	46	7
Washington	564	16
Wood	125	182
Wythe	382	20
York	84	7
Norfolk-Borough	244	218
Petersburg	124	67
Richmond	107	199
Williamsburg	36	26
	26,503	11,997
INOFFICIAL		
Lancaster	59	93
Logan	190	11
	26,752	12,101
	12,101	

Majority for Gen. Jackson in Virginia, 14,651

NORTH CAROLINA.

OFFICIAL RETURNS.

Counties.	*Jackson.*	*Adams.*
Anson	701	494
Ashee	319	107
Beaufort	372	625
Brunswick	149	175
Buncombe	762	111
Burke	1314	211
Bertie	571	210
Bladen	384	111
Cabarrus	428	321
Chowan	225	69
Columbus	300	40
Cumberland	821	325
Caswell	941	26
Chatham	698	409
Craven	550	399
Camden	426	65
Carteret	325	350
Currituck	396	35
Davidson	849	234
Duplin	546	132
Edgecomb	902	111
Franklin	630	82
Guilford	546	970
Gates	424	85
Granville	842	162
Greene	203	146
Haywood	933	3
Halifax	765	60
Hertford	379	159
Hyde	247	88
Iredell	563	571
Johnston	418	18

Jones	212	215
Lenoir	251	111
Lincoln	1191	429
Martin	461	198
Montgomery	564	331
Mecklenburg	1194	376
Moore	515	90
New Hanover	668	147
Nash	453	57
Northampton	362	228
Onslow	476	105
Orange	1057	449
Perquimons	301	134
Person	393	24
Pitt	329	485
Pasquotank	378	293
Randolph	417	619
Richmond	358	209
Rockingham	989	110
Robeson	579	264
Rowan	1197	321
Rutherford	1214	53
Sampson	599	120
Stokes	1190	245
Surry	1190	272
Tyrrell	273	20
Warren	532	33
Wake	1037	266
Wayne	538	282
Washington	315	62
Wilkes	699	310
	37,857	13,918
	13,918	
Jackson's majority	23,939	

SOUTH CAROLINA.

The Electors are chosen by the Legislature. The vote of this State was given to General Jackson.

GEORGIA.

The following is a statement of the votes given in sixty counties of this State, for Electors of President and Vice President:

Troup Ticket.		*Clark Ticket.*	
Blackshear,	10,138	Newnan,	8,447
Clayton,	10,112	Stewart,	7,659
Graves,	9,977	Burnett,	7,515
Maxwell,	10,087	Cunningham,	7,513
Moore,	9,967	Pentecost,	7,691
Porter	10,066	Hatcher,	7,265
Reid,	10,186	Mitchell,	7,605
Rutherford,	10,262	Leigh,	7,421
Terrell,	9,908	Milner,	7,489

KENTUCKY.

OFFICIAL RETURNS.

Counties.	*Jackson.*	*Adams.*
Adair	571	333
Allen	540	223
Anderson	444	107
Barren	889	766
Bath	548	343
Boone	485	442
Bourbon	849	1100
Bracken	427	452
Breckinridge	369	501
Bullitt	453	227
Butler	218	126
Caldwell	637	232
Calloway	469	49
Campbell, (not official)	544 maj.	
Casey	278	181
Christian	530	655
Clarke	537	784
Clay	58	348
Cumberland	435	327
Daviess	284	161
Edmonson	197	128
Estill	239	215
Fayette	1021	1340
Flemming	661	676
Floyd	380	92
Franklin	631	384
Gallatin	452	341
Garrard	262	1014
Grant	186	186
Graves	141	24
Grayson	247	232
Green	993	524
Greenup	302	294
Hardin	908	505
Harlan	122	214
Harrison	966	403
Hart	366	151
Henderson	255	321
Henry	672	338
Hickman	260	32
Hopkins	362	274
Jefferson	1460	1024
Jessamine	520	472
Knox	134	285
Laurel	77	141
Lawrence	283	107
Lewis	404	303
Lincoln	576	554
Livingston	373	213
Logan	342	883
Madison	653	866
Mason	860	1088
M'Cracken	94	33
Meade	150	201
Mercer	1258	525
Monroe	463	137
Montgomery	600	585
Morgan	280	62
Muhlenberg	266	259
Nelson	784	835
Nicholas	536	329
Ohio	358	213
Oldham	657	343
Owen	502	117
Pendleton (not official)	267	152
Perry	59	100
Pike	194	3
Pulaski	519	437
Rockcastle	194	249
Russell	269	194
Scott	993	555
Shelby	946	1097
Simpson	355	334
Spencer	437	218
Todd	296	486
Trigg	304	200
Union	249	199
Warren	478	674
Washington	1486	491
Wayne	578	271
Whitley	177	161
Woodford	513	647
Total,	39,071	31,167
	31,167	
Jackson majority.	7,904	

TENNESSEE.

	Jackson.	Adams.
First Electoral District,	3136	000
Second Electoral District,	3418	143
Third Electoral District,	4001	254
Fourth Electoral District,	3211	7
Fifth Electoral District,	5196	74
Sixth Electoral District,	3605	00
Seventh Electoral District,	5008	715
Eighth Electoral District,	3443	6
Ninth Electoral District,	4311	220
Tenth Electoral District,	3479	179
Eleventh Electoral District,	5282	642
	44193	2240

OHIO.

JACKSON COUNTIES.

Counties.	*Jackson.*	*Adams.*
Adams,	1327	373
Belmont,	2188	2162
Butler,	3239	953
Brown,	1560	703
Clermont,	2038	1002
Coshocton,	1031	574
Columbiana,	2431	2163
Dark,	571	190
Fayette,	627	532
Fairfield,	2606	1131
Guernsey	1259	1204
Hamilton,	4917	2716
Highland,	991	858
Harrison,	1594	1422
Hocking,	293	213
Holmes,	863	234
Hancock,	49	32
Jefferson,	1933	1556
Jackson,	390	389
Knox,	1597	735
Licking,	1826	1040
Lawrence,	270	269
Madison,	435	424
Montgomery,	1754	1709
Monroe,	741	297
Morgan,	840	697
Marion,	320	254
Vanwert, Allen, Mercer,	111	72
Pike,	487	242
Pickaway,	1536	1139
Perry,	1308	640
Richland,	1805	1283
Stark,	1770	1308
Shelby,	273	193
Tuscarawas,	1041	884
Union,	194	181
Wayne,	2045	925

ADAMS COUNTIES.

Ashtabula,	179	1936
Athens,	482	833
Champaign,	595	1048
Clinton,	715	1007
Cuyahoga,	320	1269
Clark,	637	1254
Crawford,	322	210
Delaware,	473	868
Franklin,	868	1155
Greene,	964	1197
Gallia,	439	746
Geauga,	347	2135
Huron,	583	1241
Lorain,	165	595
Harding and Logan,	275	515
Miami,	764	1089
Muskingum,	2151	2184
Medina,	160	803
Meigs,	306	579
Preble,	895	1113
Portage,	855	2107
Ross,	1780	1951
Scioto,	469	685
Sandusky,	127	209
Seneca,	242	353
Trumbull,	1590	2518
Warren,	1797	1835
Washington,	695	1086
Wood,	46	121
Williams, Putnam, Paulding, Henry,	50	76
	67,597	63,396
	63,396	
Majority for Jackson,	4,201	

INDIANA.

OFFICIAL RETURNS.

Counties.	Jackson.	Adams.
Johnson	298	199
Shelby	458	310
Henry	284	328
Hancock	65	67
Marion	379	582
Hamilton	55	156
Bartholomew	445	235
Decatur	346	292
Rush	649	345
Madison	58	72
Hendricks	204	164
Morgan	235	232
Posey	646	278
Vanderburgh	108	134
Warrick	318	73
Spencer	173	80
Switzerland	489	335
Pike	149	140
Gibson	380	239
Ripley	322	325
Dubois	180	49
Randolph	123	250
Perry	134	180
Delaware	91	63
Daviess	291	210
Harrison	705	457
Crawford	230	206
Wayne	888	1343
Union	547	518
Fayette	650	516
Franklin	693	655
Dearborn	1066	986
Allen	64	74
Clay	83	25
Putnam	632	309
Carroll	112	73
Tippecanoe	210	184
Warren	63	77
Montgomery	359	243
Fountain	468	224
Vigo	186	544
Owen	137	201
Green	320	161
Sullivan	432	168
Knox	420	405

Parke	480	559
Martin	191	68
Vermillion	282	287
Monroe	570	223
Clark	953	615
Orange	631	285
Floyd	590	374
Washington	1083	612
Lawrence	823	218
Jefferson	627	706
Jennings	204	290
Scott	283	147
Jackson	405	182
	22237	17052

ILLINOIS.

OFFICIAL RETURNS.

COUNTIES.	Names of Candidates for Electors.					
	Young.	Houston.	Taylor.	Ills.	Thompson.	Webb.
Marion,	77	77	77	13	13	13
Wabash,	109	109	109	193	193	193
Edwards,	184	184	184	118	118	118
Montgomery,	208	208	208	47	47	47
Jackson,	142	142	142	14	14	14
Clay,	102	102	102	13	13	13
Clinton,	130	110	130	74	74	74
Washington,	73	72	71	28	27	27
Shelby,	238	238	238	32	32	32
Fulton,	53	53	71	85	85	85
St. Clair,	535	538	539	334	337	334
White,	428	428	428	213	213	213
Hamilton,	270	270	270	11	11	11
Wayne,	205	205	205	30	30	30
Perry,	31	31	31	7	7	7
Union,	234	234	234	29	30	30
Johnson,	95	96	96	6	6	6
Alexander,	37	37	37	29	22	11
Tazewell,	149	149	149	109	109	109
Pope,	254	255	255	56	56	56
Gallatin,	435	417	428	104	111	111
Jefferson,	224	224	224	31	31	31
Bond,	151	151	151	114	114	114
Randolph,	368	365	369	156	161	159
Monroe,	167	166	——	83	84	84
Madison,	390	390	390	348	347	348
Greene,	484	482	485	203	205	203
Morgan,	702	702	702	282	282	279
Sangamon,	677	680	682	431	431	431
Vermillion,	224	224	223	110	64	110
Edgar,	192	192	192	120	120	120
Clarke,	100	100	100	115	115	115
Crawford,	230	232	224	101	101	101
Lawrence,	247	247	247	131	131	134
Calhoun,	42	42	42	57	57	57
Pike,	53	43	54	117	117	116
Adams,	72	72	72	65	64	65
Peoria,	41	43	46	91	93	78
Fayette,	200	200	200	70	70	70
Joe Daviess,	613	613	613	442	442	442
Franklin,	320	320	320	11	11	11
Schuyler,	74	76	75	56	56	56
Total,	9560	9518	9415	4662	4634	4659

JACKSON CANDIDATES.

Richard M. Young,	9,560
Alexander M. Houston,	9,518
John Taylor,	9,415

ADAMS CANDIDATES.

Elijah Iles,	4,662
Samuel H. Thompson,	4,634
George Webb,	4,659

SCATTERING.

John Ewing*	15
John Houston,*	35
—— McNabb,*	14
John M. Taylor,*	167
William Webb,	1
Andrew Paxson,	4
James Thompson,†	46

* These votes were evidently intended for the Jackson candidates, which would give the highest Jackson candidate a majority of 4,902 over the highest Adams candidate.
† Which added, makes Mr. Thompson's vote 1,680.

4680

ALABAMA.

We learn from Mr. H. Philpot, the messenger who was selected to bring on the electoral votes of Alabama, that the vote in that State was, for Jackson and Calhoun 17,138—for Adams and Rush 1,938. Several counties not heard from.

MISSISSIPPI.

The following is the state of the polls for Electors of President in the State of Mississippi, with the exception of Simpson county:

Counties.	*Jackson.*	*Adams.*
Monroe	362	16
Hinds	411	57
Yazoo	229	4
Madison	140	14
Copiah	495	40
Rankin	51	4
Lawrence	490	40
Covington	209	17
Marion	250	48
Pike	396	25
Jones	124	1
Wayne	156	35
Wilkinson	576	161
Perry	164	10
Greene	99	20
Adams	422	335
Jefferson	491	194
Claiborne	673	232
Warren	412	170
Franklin	285	42
Hancock	61	8
Jackson	73	11
Washington	54	18
Amite	446	79
	6772	1581

Jackson's majority, 5191.

LOUISIANA.
OFFICIAL RETURNS.

Parishes.	*Jackson.*	*Adams.*
Placquemine,	29	68
St. Bernard,	56	89
New Orleans,	747	665
Jefferson,	24	63
St. Charles,	37	54
St. John Baptist,	30	77
St. James,	76	153
Ascension,	106	106
Assumption,	140	140
Lafourche Interior,	39	338
Terrebonnee,	42	54
Iberville,	190	66
West Baton Rouge,	72	62
Point Coupee,	93	68
West Feliciana,	225	98
East Feliciana,	441	80
East Baton Rouge,	247	149
St. Helena,	294	53
Washington,	181	44
St. Tammany,	164	46
Catahoula,	147	38
Washita,	141	91
Natchitoches and Claiborne,	242	139
Rapides,	241	83
St. Mary,	85	130
St. Martin,	63	257
St. Landry,	135	543
Lafayette,	208	158
Concordia,	70	42
Avoyelles,	40	123
Total,	4603	4078

MISSOURI.
OFFICIAL RETURNS.

Counties.	*Jackson.*	*Adams.*
Howard,	658	355
Charlton,	361	102
Cole,	331	46
Boone,	520	296
Montgomery,	234	127
Callaway,	267	168
St. Charles,	248	146
Pike,	260	238
Ste. Genevieve,	112	48
Washington,	356	190
Madison,	271	56
St. Francois,	189	89
Jefferson,	152	72
Ralls,	117	50
Cooper,	458	203
Lafayette,	322	60
Franklin,	267	61
Saline,	150	30
Ray,	186	31
Lincoln,	231	141
Clay,	364	125
Cape Girardeau,	457	148
St. Louis,	609	443
Scott,	66	23
Jackson,	210	3
Wayne,	218	5
Perry,	196	49
Marion,	159	103
Gasconade,	205	6
New Madrid,	58	58
	8272	3400

The following Table exhibits, in a condensed form, a statement of popular votes given in the several States:

STATES.	Whole vote for Jackson.	Whole vote for Adams.	Majority for Jackson.	Majority for Adams.
Maine	13,927	20,773	. .	6,846
New Hampshire	26,922	24,124	. .	3,202
Vermont	8,363	24,364	. .	16,011
Massachusetts	6,019	29,837	. .	23,818
Rhode Island	821	2,754	. .	1,933
Connecticut	4,448	13,839	. .	9,390
New York	140,763	135,413	5,350	. .
New Jersey	21,951	23,761	. .	1,810
Pennsylvania	101,652	50,848	50,804	. .
Delaware*	. .	. .	. .	. .
Maryland	24,565	25,527	. .	962
Virginia	26,752	12,101	14,651	. .
North Carolina	37,857	13,918	23,939	. .
South Carolina*	. .	. .	. .	. .
Georgia	19,362	642	18,720	. .
Alabama	13,384	1,934	11,450	. .
Mississippi	6,772	1,581	5,191	. .
Louisiana	4,605	4,078	527	. .
Tennessee	44,193	2,240	41,953	. .
Kentucky	39,084	31,172	7,912	. .
Ohio	67,597	63,396	4,201	. .
Indiana	22,237	17,052	5,185	. .
Illinois	9,560	4,659	4,901	. .
Missouri	8,272	3,400	4,872	. .
Aggregate majorities	643,096 507,412	507,412	199,656 63,972	63,972
Jackson majorities,	135,684		135,684	

* The Electors are appointed by the Legislature.

Names of persons in nomination for Electors of President and Vice President of the United States, for the eleventh election, from the 4th of March, 1829.

MAINE.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Isaac Lane	Thomas Fillebrown*
Daniel Rose	Simon Nowell*
Henry Hobbs	Joseph Prime*
James C. Churchill*	Elias Thomas
Moses Carlton	Ebenezer Farley*
Cornelius Holland	John S. Kimball*
Abijah Smith	Joseph Southwick*
William Spaulding	Levi Hubbard*
William Webber.	John Moore.*

Those marked thus (*) were elected.

VERMONT.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Martin Field	Jonas Galusha
Lyman Fitch	Ezra Butler
John W. Dana	John Phelps
Truman Chittenden	Apollos Austin
Joseph Reed	Asa Aldis
Abel Tomlinson	Josiah Dana
John Jackson.	William Jarvis.

The Adams ticket succeeded.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
John Harvey	George Sullivan
Benning M. Bean	Samuel Quarles
William Pickering	Nahum Parker
Jesse Bowers	Samuel Sparhawk
Aaron Matson	William Bixby
Jonathan Nye	Thomas Woolson
Stephen P. Webster	Ezra Bartlett
Moses White.	William Lovejoy.

The Adams ticket succeeded.

MASSACHUSETTS.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Nathan Willis	Thomas C. Winthrop
David Henshaw	Samuel Lathrop
Phineas Allen	Jesse Putnam
Joseph M. Forward	Stephen White
John Drury	Bailey Bartlett
Jonas Sibley	Nathan Chandler
William Willard	Jonathan Davis
William Austin	Edmund Cushing
John K. Simpson	Eliel Frost
Ebenezer Seaver	John Gilbert
Elihu Dagget, Jr.	Samuel Jones
Peter H. Pierce	Edward H. Robbins
John P. Norton	Oliver Starkweather
Josiah Newhall	Braddock Dimick
John Russ.	Seth Sprague.

The Adams ticket succeeded.

RHODE ISLAND.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Wilkins Updike	Caleb Earle
Henry Bull	Stephen B. Cornell
Nathan B. Sprague	Elisha Watson
Thomas Remington.	Charles Elbridge.

The Adams ticket succeeded.

CONNECTICUT.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Noah A. Phelps	Sylvester Norton
William Todd	Rufus Hitchcock
John P. Trott	Moses Warren
Henry Sherwood	Charles Hawley
David Bolles	Roger Taintor
John Welch	Homer Boardman
John Stewart, 2d.	George Pratt
Ingoldsby W. Crawford.	Walter R. Kibbee.

The Adams ticket succeeded.

NEW-YORK.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Moses Rolph*	Elbert H. Jones
John Garrison*	Samuel G. Vabryck
Benjamin Bailey*	Marinus Willett
John Targee*	James Fairlee
Gilbert Coutant*	Peter A. Jay
Jacob Odell*	John Odell
Morgan Lewis*	Daniel C. Verplanck
Egbert Jansen*	James Burt
John E. Russell*	Abraham Hasbrouch
Moses Younglove	Alexander Coffin*
Jacob Yates	Gilbert Eddy*
John Tayler	Abraham Van Vechten*
Peter Pine*	Alanson Buel
Joseph C. Yates*	Isaac M. Schemerhorn
Elkanah Brush*	John Badger
Henry Wager	Eben'r. B. Shearman*
Rufus Crane*	Jacob Marshall
John Fay	Archibald McIntyre*
Howell Gardiner	Salmon Childs*
John Gale	Peter H. Myers*
Josiah Fisk	James Campbell*
Charles Dayan	Jesse Smith*
Alvin Bronson	Augustus Chapman*
Thomas Blakeslee*	John W. Harper
John S. Boyd	Benjamin Cotton*
Freeborn G. Jewett*	Azariah Smith
Asaph Stow*	Christopher Morgan
Andrew D. W. Bruyn*	Charles Pumpelly
Thomas Rogers, 2d.	John Beal*
Asa Cole	William Hildreth*
Matthew Warner	James H. Guernsey*
John Lloyd*	Clark Crandall
Hiram Frisbee	Shubal Dunham*
Samuel Russell.	Ebenezer Walden.*

Nominations in the Electoral College.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
John Tayler*	John D. P. Douw*
Charles Dayan*	Abel French

Those marked thus (*) were elected.

NEW-JERSEY.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Abraham Godwin	T. Prelinghuysen
William McCullough	A. Leaming
Robert H. McCarter	A. White
George Maxwell	Gabriel Hoff
William I. Conover	J. J. Ely
William N. Shinn	Abraham Brown
Joseph Kille	T. Elmer
Cresse Townsend.	C. Zabriskie.

The Adams ticket succeeded.

PENNSYLVANIA.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
John B Gibson	Gabriel Heister
William Findlay	John Reed
Edward King	Charles Penrose
John Lisle	Samuel Wetherill
Jacob Holgate	Robert Kennedy
Samuel Humes, sen.	Samuel Dale
John W. Cunningham	David Townsend
George G. Leiper	Pierce Crosby
Henry Sheetz	Philip Reed
Adam Ritscher	Jacob Godhart
David Hottenstein	George Schall
Peter Fraley	George Rush
Francis Baird	William Watts
Henry Winters	Georg Weber
William Thompson	George Denmson
Leonard Ropert	Daniel Montgomery
Jacob Gearhart	William Wilson
George Baroltz	James S. Mitchell
Jacob Heyser	John Reed
John Harper	John Hershberger
John Scott	Conrad Bucher
William Piper	Henry Black
Valentine Geisy	Jeremiah Kendall
James Gordon	Thomas McCall
John M. Snowden	Francis McClure
Robert Scott	Jacob Machlin
Henry Allshouse	John Loringier
James Duncan.	John Leech.

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

DELAWARE.

The Electors are chosen by the Legislature.
Adams Electors were appointed.

James Canby	David Hazard.
John Adams	

VIRGINIA.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
William C. Holt	James Madison †
William H. M'Farland	James Monroe †
John Cargill	Stephen Wright
Thomas M. Nelson	Benjamin Harrison
Richard Logan	Joseph Goodwyn
James Jones	Richard Field
William Daniel	Edward C. Carrington
Joseph Martin	Benjamin Hatcher
William F. Gordon	Samuel Branch
Wm. Brockenbrough	Fleming Saunders
George Buckner*	David S Garland
William Jones	Chapman Johnson
Robert M'Candlish	Francis T. Brooke
Ellyson Currie	Charles Hill
John W. Green	Robert Lively
John Gibson	Hancock Eustice
George Rust	Wm. A G Dade
Jared Williams	Alfred H Powell
Jacob D. Williamson	Joseph Mauzeu
John Bowyer	Archibald Stuart
John E. George	Ballard Smith
Andrew Russell	Benjamin Estill
Joel Shrewsbury	Lewis Summers
John M'Millan.	Alpheos P. Wilson.

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

* A few days previous to the meeting of the Electors Mr. George Buckner died, and Mr. Garret Minor was chosen to fill the vacancy.

† Those gentlemen declined, and the vacancy was filled by Mr. John Shackleford and Col. William Ellzey.

MARYLAND.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Joseph Stone	Henry Brawner*
John C Herbert	Benj. F. Forest*
Wm Fitzhugh, Jr.*	George Beltzer
William Tyler*	William Price
John S Sellman*	James Boyle
Benjamin C. Howard*	Wm. Stewart
Elias Brown*	Jas. H. M'Culloch
Thomas M Forman	James Sewell*
John T. Rees	Thomas Emory*
James Sangston	T. R. Lockerman*
Thomas K Carroll.	Littleton Dennis.*

Those marked thus (*) were elected.

NORTH CAROLINA.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Robert Lowe	Isaac N Lamb
Montfort Stokes	Samuel Kenon
Peter Forney	Wm. S. Blackledge
John Giles	William Clark
Abraham Phillips	Edward Hall
John M. Morehead	William Hinton
Walter F. Leake	Daniel Kenon
Willie P. Mangum	Benjamin Roberson
Josiah Crudup	Edmund Deberry
John Hall	James S. Smith
Joseph J. Williams	Alexander Gray
Kedar Ballard	James T. Morehead
Louis D. Wilson	Abner Franklin
Richard Dobbs Spaight	Robert Burton
Edward B. Dudley.	Isaac T. Avery.

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

The Electors are chosen by the Legislature.
Jackson Electors were appointed.

Sanders Glover	William Pope
David R. Evans	John McComb
John Stewart	Arthur P. Hayne
David Sloan	Green B Colvin
William Johnston	Henry L. Pinckney.
Wade Hampton, Jr	

GEORGIA.

JACKSON TICKET.

TROUP PARTY.	CLARK PARTY.
John Rutherford	Daniel Newnan
Robert R. Reid	John Stewart
David Blackshear	Henry Mitchell
Augustin S. Clayton	John Burnett
Solomon Graves	John Cunningham
John Maxwell	William Pentecost
Oliver Porter	John Hatcher
William Terrell	Benjamin Leigh
Seaton Grantland.	Pitt Milner.

ADAMS TICKET.

John Burch	Thomas Murray.

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

ALABAMA.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Thomas Mosley	James Dellett
Enoch Parsons	—— Weatherspoon
Wm Y Higgins	J. G. Birney
John A Elmore	George Coulter
Thos. D. Crabb.	—— Smith.

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

MISSISSIPPI.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Joseph Dunbar	I. R. Nicholson
Wiley P. Harris	William Lang
William Dowsing.	Edward M'Gehee.

The Jackson ticket succeeded

LOUISIANA.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
John B Plauche	Benjamin Morris
Thos W. Scott	Neuville Declouet
Trasimon Landry	Jaques Villere
Alexander Mouton	Charles Bushnell
Placide Bossier.	Louis Le Blanc.

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

TENNESSEE.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
John Rhea	Moses F Roberts
Samuel Bunch	Boyd M'Nairy
Thomas McCorry	John R. Nelson
Benjamin C. Stout	Isaac Rawlings
Andrew J. Marchbanks	William Cox
George Elliott	James Taylor.
William A. Sublett	
Alfred Flournoy	[Not a full ticket in nomination.]
Joseph Brown	
Willie Blount	
Adam R. Alexander.	

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

KENTUCKY.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Thomas S. Slaughter	John M. Cowell
Matthew Lyon	Joseph Earl
Edmund Watkins	Thomas Bodley
Nathan Gaither	Richard Taylor
Tunstall Quarles	Duval Paine
Reuben Munday	Christopher Tompkins
Benjamin Chapeze	Burr Harrison
John Younger	Joseph Allen
John Sterrett	Alney Whean
Benjamin Taylor	John Anderson
Robert J Ward	Ephraim Ewing
Tandy Allen	Richard Southgate
Richard French	Thomas C. Howard
Thompson Ward.	Gabriel Slaughter.

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

OHIO.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Ethan Allen Brown	Jeremiah Morrow
George M'Cook	Peter Hitchcock
William Piatt	William Ruffin
James Shields	James M'Bride
Henry Barrington	Joseph C. Hawkins
Thomas Gillespie	Benjamin Whitem
Thomas L. Hamer	John Smith
Valentine Keffer	Duncan M'Arthur
Robert Lucas	William Kendall
John M'Elvain	Ralph Osborn
Samuel Herrick	Isaac Van Horne
George Sharp	John Patterson
Walter M. Blake	John M'Laughlin
Benjamin Jones	William Fogle
William Hayne	Aaron Wheeler
Hugh M'Fall.	Ebenezer Lane.

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

INDIANA.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
Benj. V. Beckes	Joseph Bartholeme
Jesse B. Durham	Isaac Montgomery
Ross Smiley	John Watts
Ratliff Boon	Amaziah Morgan
William Lowe.	Joseph Orr.

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

ILLINOIS.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
John Taylor	Elijah Iles.
Alexander M. Houston	Samuel H. Thomps
Richard M. Young.	George Webb.

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

MISSOURI.

JACKSON.	ADAMS.
John Bull	Benjamin H. Reave
Benjamin O'Fallon	Joseph C. Brown
Augustus Jones.	John Hall.

The Jackson ticket succeeded.

CONTENTS

OF THE

UNITED STATES' TELEGRAPH—EXTRA,

VOLUME I.

Page.

No. 1—March 1, 1828.

Address of the Central Jackson Committee of Kentucky, to the people of Kentucky 1
Investigation of the charge against Mr. Clay, before the Kentucky Legislature, - 5
Evidence of M. Millan - - - ib
Gridia - - - ib
Tanner - - - 6
Kendall - - - ib
— - - - 7
— - - - 8
— - - - 9
Carnial - - - 6
Keene - - - 7
McAlear - - - ib
Shackleford - - ib
Johnson - - - ib
Blair - - - 9
Mason - - - 10
Hitt - - - 11
Bills - - - ib
Miller - - - ib
Desha - - - ib
Lee and others - - ib
Harrison - - - 10 12
Dudley - - - ib
Summers - - - ib
Halbert and Hamrick - 13
Letter of T. P. Moore, to the editor of the Kentucky Central Watch Tower, on the subject of Mr. Adams's accounts - 13
Green & Jarvis to the patrons of the Telegraph - - - - - 16

No. 2—March 21, 1828.

Six Militia men - - - - 17
Sec'y of War to Gov. Blount - - 18
Do to Do - - - ib
Do to General Jackson - ib
General order of Governor Blount - ib
Division order of General Jackson - ib
Sec'y of War to Do - - ib
John Blair to Messrs. Green & Jarvis - ib
Extract from Alexander's Letter - ib
Report of the Committee on Military Affairs, concerning the Tennessee Militia men - - - - - 20
Days of Yore, signed "Spirit of '76," from the Doylestown Democrat - - 23
The *private* integrity of Mr. Adams - 24
Mr. Adams's *political* integrity - 26
Do Do Do - - 27
Letter of Horatio Townsend - - 28
Affidavit of John B. Derby - - ib
Certificate of James Richardson - ib
Governor Giles to the public - - ib
Proposals of Green & Jarvis - - 32

No. 3—March 28, 1828.

Letter from the Jackson Committee at Nashville, in answer to one from a similar Committee, at Cincinnati, upon the subject of General Jackson's Marriage, accompanied by documents, in an Appendix thereto annexed - - - 33
Appendix No. 1—James Breckenridge - 37
No. 2—John M'Nairy - - 38
No. 3—Elizabeth Craighead - ib
No. 4—Sally Smith - - 39
No. 5—Mary H. Bowen - ib
No 6—Thomas Crutcher - 40
No. 8*—James Ray - - 41
* It should have been printed No. 7.
No. 9—John McGinnis - ib
No. 10—Thomas Allin - - ib
No. 11—John Meaux - - 42
No. 12—A. Foster - - ib
No. 13—John Overton - - ib
Remarks of Green & Jarvis on the subject 45
George S Lane to Green & Jarvis - ib
Green & Jarvis in reply to the Journal, upon the expected nomination of Mr. Webster - - - - - 46
Sunday School Union; from the American Sentinel - - - - ib
Proposals of Green & Jarvis - - 48

No. 4—April 5, 1828.

Jefferson. To the Editors of the Richmond Enquirer; from the Nashville Republican - - - - - 49

No. 5—Aprill 12, 1828

Continuation of Jefferson - - 65
Mr. Adams' Defence of General Jackson; from the Ithaca Journal - - 67
The tricks of the Coalition - - 71
Correspondence between Governur Blount and the Secretary of War, respecting the Tennessee troops - - - ib
General Jackson's Address to the Tennessee troops - - - - 72
His Letter to Col. Cocke - - 73
Do to Governor Blount - - ib
Governor Blount's Answer - - 74
Secretary of War to Governor Blount - 75
Do to Do - - ib
Do to General Jackson - ib
Governor Blount to Do - - ib
General Order of General Jackson - ib
Secretary of war to the Editor - - 76
Col. Pipkin - - - - ib
Col. Russel - - - - ib
Certificate of Charles J. Nourse, Chief Clerk of the Department of War - 77
A Farmer. To the Hon. Mr. Everett - 78
Gen. Jackson and Mr. Clay's Book - 79
Mr. Calhoun - - - - 80
Mr. Sutherland's amendment to the Tariff ib

Page.

No. 6—April 19, 1828.

Green & Jarvis to Subscribers - 81
"The real state of the case" reviewed, or a vindication of the Committee on Manufactures - - - ib
Accounting Officers of the Treasury - 84
Mr. J S. Barbour's resolution and Speech ib
Chief Justice Marshall - - 90
His letter to John H Pleasants - ib
Remarks of Green & Jarvis - 91
Extract from Mr. Randolph's speech on Retrenchment - - - ib
Remarks of Green & Jarvis concerning Mr. Adams and the Tariff - - 92
J. Adams's Letter to Mr. Cunningham - ib
President Adams—from the Democratic Eagle - - - - 93
Further remarks of Green & Jarvis on Manufactures and the Tariff - - 94
"The Minister to England"—from the Boston Patriot, credited to the Democratic Press - - - - 95
Remarks of Green & Jarvis - - ib
David Crockett. To Green & Jarvis on the Presidential question - - - 96

No. 7—April 26, 1828.

Gen. Jackson's Literature - - 97
Mr. Van Buren's observations on Mr. Foot's amendment to the Rules of the Senate, by which it was proposed to give the Vice President the right to call to order for words spoken in debate - - 103

No. 8—April 30, 1828.

The Six Militiamen—from the Baltimore Republican - - - - 113
D. S. Carr to Hon. J. K. Polk. - - ib
Polk's answer - - - - 114
Governor Blount's order to Gen. Jackson 117
His affidavit - - - - 118
Gen. Jackson's order to his division - ib
J. K. Polk to Hon. E. Livingston - ib
Mr. Livingston's answer - - ib
T. W. Armstrong to Hon. J. K. Polk - 119
Hon. L. White and J. K. Polk to Major Gen. E. P. Gaines - - - ib
Gen. Gaines's answer - - - ib
General Greene - - - 120
Execution of Militiamen - - 121
Internal Improvement - - - ib
Speech of Mr. McLane on - - ib
Do. of the Vice President, Mr. Calhoun 125
The Webster Bargain - - - 127
F. R. Stockton, to the Editor of the N. Y. Evening Post - - - ib
The National Gazette - - - 128
Remarks of Green and Jarvis, on a Letter from Kentucky on the election - ib
The Six Militiamen - - - ib
Additional remarks on the subject by the Editors - - - - ib

No. 9—May 7, 1828.

Expenditures in the Department of State 129
Report of the Committee on so much of the Public Accounts and expenditures as relates to the State Department - ib
Secretary of State to Hon. John Blair, Chairman, &c. - - - 135
Mr. Pleasonton to Mr. Clay - - 136
Mr. Nourse to Mr. Pleasonton - - 137
Statement showing the disbursements &c. ib

Pa

Economy—remarks by the Editors - 1
The Public Debt—remarks by the Editors 1
Remarks on the subject of the postage of the Extra - - - - -

No. 10—May 10, 1828.

Reply by the Jackson Corresponding Committee of the District of Columbia, to Mr. Clay's last Address - - - 1
Mr. Clay to the Editors of the National Intelligencer - - - - 1
Mr. Adams' reply - - -
Extracts from Wayne - - - -
Extracts from a series of letters addressed to Mr. Adams - - - - 1

No. 11—May 10, 1828.

Reply continued - - - - 1

No. 12—May 10, 1828.

Reply continued - - - - 1
Confirmation of Mr. Millan's testimony 1
Appendix No. 1—the investigation in the Kentucky legislature 1
The bargain—more proof - - 1
Certificate of Frizzle and others - - 1
of P. M. Savage - - 1
of Geo. Rea - - -
of A. Duke - - -
Appendix No. 2—letter of T. P. Moore

No. 13—May 10, 1828.

Reply continued - - - - 1
Letter of T. P. Moore, continued -
Appendix No. 3—letter of C. A. Wickliffe - - - 1
No. 4—letter of John Floyd of Va. - - -
No. 5—letter of A. Greer -
No. 6—letter of R. K Call - 1
No. 7—letter of J. H. Eaton - 1
letter of John McLean 1
letter of O. B. Brown
No. 8—letter of G. Kremer - 1
No. 9—letter of Hu. L. White
No. 10—letter of J. C. Isacks -
No 11—letter of John Blair - 1
No. 12—extract of Mr Saunder's letter in reply to Gov. Kent - -
Remarks on the reply of the Committee, &c. by the Editors - - - 2
D Green to Thomas Speed, Esq. Bairdstown, Kentucky - - - 2
Statement of John S. Meehan - - 2
Speech of Mr. Barbour in the Senate of the U. S. March 31st, 1818, on introducing the proposition for causing a sword to be presented to Col. R. M. Johnson - - - -
Communication to the Editors, on the probable result of the Presidential election 2
Remarks by the Editors on the same subject - - - - -

No. 14—June 14, 1828.

Retrenchment, report of the Select Committee thereon, in part - - 2
Appendix No. 1—containing a circular letter of the chairman Mr. Hamilton, to the head of each of the Executive Departments, and of the Post Office Department, accompanied by the resolution of the Committee - - 2

Page.
Appendix No. 2—letter of the Secretary of State to the chairman - - 217
Appropriations and expenditures - 220
Summary statement of moneys appropriated and expended - - - 221
Secretary of State to Hon. C. A. Wickliffe - - - - - 223
Remittances to Europe - - - 224

No. 15—June 21, 1828.

Report of the Select Committee on retrenchment, and accompanying documents, continued - - - 225
Statement of sums remitted to Europe, between 7th October, and last day of December 1824, for the service of the Department of State, and between same dates in 1827 - - - - ib
Joseph Nourse, Register—to the chairman of the committee - - - 226
Statement of the sums of money which have been disbursed through the State Department, and settled at the Treasury upon the certificate of the President without specification, since the 1st of July, 1790, &c - - - - - 226
Secretary of State to the chairman of the committee - - - - ib
Extracts of a letter from Mr. Forbes to Mr. Clay - - - - - 227
Mr. Pleasants to Mr. Clay - - - ib
Extract of a letter from the same to same 228
Journal of proceedings of the Committee on Retrenchment - - - ib
Thos. B. Dashiel, Geo. W. Dashiel, and Dr. Laurie, examined before the committee - - - - - 232
Mr Nourse examined - - - 233
His letter to the committee - - 234
Mr. Graham's testimony - - - ib
His letter to the committee - - 235
Jon Mr. Barton examined - - ib
Mr. Letcher's testimony - - - 236
Mr. McLean's testimony - - - 237
Mr. Letcher's letter - - - 238
Mr Way examined - - - ib
Mr. Cutts examined - - - 239
His letter to Thos. L. McKenney - 240
Thos. L. McKenney to the Sec'y of War ib
Correspondence between Mr. Chairman and Mr. Nourse, on the subject of Mr. Cook - - - - - ib

No. 16—June 28, 1828.

Report of the Select Committee on retrenchment, and accompanying documents, continued - - - 241
Journal of proceedings of the committee continued - - - - ib
The Chairman to the Secretary of State - ib
Mr. Grouard examined - - - ib
Mr. Smoot do - - - 242
Mr. Meeban do - - - ib
Mr. Elliot do - - - 243
Secretary of State to the chairman - ib
Mr. Smoot's letter - - - ib
Messrs. Gales & Seaton's letter - - 244
Testimony of Stewart - - - ib
Testimony of Peters - - - ib
The Chairman of the committee to the Secretary of State - - - ib
Gales & Seaton to the Committee - 245
Secretary of War to the chairman - ib

Page.
Post-master General to the do - - 247
Gales & Seaton to the do - - ib
Affidavits of Way and Weightman - 248
Gales & Seaton to Hon. S. D. Ingham - ib
Mr. Clay's last book—remarks by the Editors - - - - - - 249
Letter of George Robertson to Col. Davidson - - - - - - 250
Jackson and Washington, from the Baltimore Republican - - - 256
Mr. Yancey's circular - - - 256
Editors correspondence - - - ib
Jackson in New Hampshire - - ib

No. 17—July 5, 1828.

Address to Gen. Washington - - 257
Letter of J. H. Eaton to Green & Jarvis - ib
Letter of Mr. B. Giles to J. H. Eaton - 257
Letter of Edward Livingston to do - 258
"Sign" in Boston - - - 261
Extract from Mr. Clay's speech in the Senate U. S. against the bill to renew the charter of the Bank of the U. S.—from the National Intelligencer - 262
Mr. Clay's pecuniary embarrassments - 266
Remarks by the Editors - - - ib
Letter of Robert Wickliffe to Messrs. Smith & Palmer—from the Kentucky Reporter - - - - 268
H. Clay to Robert Wickliffe - - ib
Diogenes—from the Kentucky Gazette - 269
Extracts from Mr. Clay's speech against the renewal of the charter of the old Bank of the U. S.—remarks by the Editors - - - - - 270
The under current, and the tariff - ib
Movements of the people - - 271
A true sign in Herkimer—from the Little Falls People's friend - - - ib
More signs—from the Dutchess True Am. ib
Another sign—from the Syracuse Adver. ib
Still another—from the Salina Herald - ib
The "great republican" Administration meetings—from the Albany Argus - ib

No. 18—July 12, 1828.

"Sketch of J. Q. Adams" - - 273
Remarks by the Editors - - - ib
Extract from the address of the Republican Committee of Bucks County, Pa. to their constituents - - - ib
An exposition of the political character and principles of John Quincy Adams, showing by historical documents and incontestible facts, that he was educated a *monarchist*, &c - - - 274
Letter of Henry Horn and John M. Dallas, to Samuel D. Ingham - - - ib
Mr. Ingham's Reply - - - ib
Affidavit of Horatio Townsend - - 280
Do of John B. Derby - - ib
Statement of James Richardson - - ib
Appendix—Letter of John Q. Adams, to Levitt Harris, Esq. Charge d'Affaires of the United States, at St. Petersburg - 286
The National Intelligencer again at its *Tricks* - - - - - ib
Calculations of votes - - - ib

No. 19—July 19, 1828.

General Jackson's qualifications as a legislator - - - - - 289
General Jackson and the Floridas - 291

Page.

General Jackson to the Secretary of State 291
Laws of Florida; from the Floridian - 295
General Jackson to the citizens of the Floridas; from the same - - - 296
Proclamation of General Jackson, Governor of the Floridas; from the same - 297
The Secretary of State, to Don Joaquin d'Anduaga - - - - 298

No. 20—July 26, 1828.

The Secretary of State, to Don Joaquin d'Anduaga, continued - - 305
Mr. Clay - - - - - ib
Mr. Clay and Mr. Kendall - - 306
J. Harvie to H. Clay - - - ib
H. Clay to J. Harvie - - - ib
Letter of A. Kendall - - - 308
Letter of A. Kendall - - - 309
Do of Do - - - - ib
Letter V. to Henry Clay, Esq. by A. Kendall - - - - - ib
Letters of Mr. Clay to A. Kendall - 318
Letter of A. Kendall to David White, Esq. 319
David White to A. Kendall - - ib
Copy of a Letter from J. J. Crittenden to David White - - - - 320

No. 21—August 2, 1828.

Extract of a Letter from F. P. Blair to David White - - - - 321
Letters of A. Kendall - - - 322
Letter V. to Henry Clay, Esq. by A. Kendall, concluded - - - ib
H. Clay to A. Kendall - - - ib
Do to Do - - - 323
Do to Do - - - 324
Do to Do - - - ib
Mr. Tanner's Letter to A. Kendall - 325
Extract from the Introduction to the unpublished Annals of Mr. Jefferson - 326
J. Pope to Mr. Penn; from the Louisville Advertiser - - - - 327
Plot in the South; from the Richmond Enquirer - - - - - 330
Xenophon—Mr. John Lowell; from the Boston Statesman - - - 333
Circular Address, of the Republican Committee of Correspondence for Pennsylvania - - - - - 335
Mr. Adams and the Federalists; from the Buffalo Republican - - - 336

No. 22—August 9, 1828.

The Maryland Address; remarks by the Editors - - - - 337
Address of the Jackson State Convention, to the people of Maryland, on the late and approaching election of President, (second edition,) - - - ib
Appendix - - - - 343
Jackson Republican - - - 352

No. 23—August 16, 1828.

General Jackson and Governor Shelby - 353
Treaty with the Chickasaws - - 354
Extract of a Letter from Thomas H. Shelby to Col. C. S. Todd - - - 356
W. B. Lewis to the Editors; from the Kentucky Argus - - - - 357
Jackson & Burr; from the Virginia Advocate - - - - - 360
General Jackson to Judge Williams - ib

Page.

Judge Williams' reply - - - 3
His statement, in addition - - 3
List of gentlemen present, when Burr was burnt in effigy, in Nashville - - 3
Letter of Thomas G. Watkins - -
General Jackson to Mr. Jefferson 3
Thomas Jefferson Randolph to J. A. G Davis, Esq - - -
Joshua Baker - - - 3
Summary of Facts; from the Argus of W. America - - - - 3

No. 24—August 23, 1828.

New Publications. Remarks by the Editors on the production entitled "Monumental Inscriptions; compiled from official documents, communicated by the Department of War" - - - 3
Letter of Charles Lewis to Green & Jarvis - - - - 37
Glorious Jackson meeting in Washington Square—from the Baltimore Republican 37
Address - - - - - il
Diplomacy of the present Administration—from the Richmond Enquirer by Publicola - - - - - 37
Arts of the affiliated Presses—from the Richmond Enquirer - - - 37
Extract of a letter from Andrew Stevenson, Esq. to one of the Editors - ib
Do do from Judge R. E. Parker - - - - - 378
Judge Parker to the Editors of the Whig 379
Mr. Clay's Appendix—from the Washington [Pa.] Examiner - - - 380
Statement of Mr. Sample - - ib
Thos. Morgan's letter - - - ib
McLaughlin to Morgan - - - 381
Morgan to Workman - - - ib
Workman to Morgan - - - ib
Address of the Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, to the people - - - - - 381
Letter I—To John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, Lawrence Lewis, C. C. Biddle, and Joseph P. Norris, Esqs., authors of an address, adopted, &c. - - 382
The Anti-Masonic Convention—from the Albany Argus - - - - 384
Tribute to Maj. J. Hamilton, jun.—from the Charleston Mercury - - ib
Signs—Civil and Military.

No. 25—August 30, 1828.

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, &c. to John Sergeant, Manuel Eyre, &c.—Letter II - - - 385
Letter III—of same to the same - 387
Letter IV " " - 389
Letter V " " - 391
Letter VI " " - 393
Letter VII " " - 395
Letter VIII " " - 396
Pennsylvania—remarks by the Editors - 398
Letter addressed by the Republican Committee of Correspondence of Philadelphia to the Committees of Correspondence of other States - - - 398
Pennsylvania—from the Philadelphia "American Sentinel," - - - 399
Ohio Politics - - - - 400
Maine - - - - - ib

Page.
Mr. Randolph and Mr. Adams—from the Boston Statesman - - - 400

No. 26—September 6, 1828.

Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, &c. to John Sergeant, Manual Erie, &c. Letter IX - - - 401
Letter X - - - - 402
Letter XI - - - - 404
Letter XII - - - - 407
Letter XIII - - - - 410
Quid pro quo—The bargaining system developed—Mr. Clay, Gen. Porter, and the New-York Legislature of 1824—from the Rochester Daily Advertiser - 413
Extract from the Albany Argus - - ib
Genncssee—to the Editors of the Daily Advertiser - - - - 414
Burr and Jackson—from the Nashville Republican - - - - 415
Gen Wool - - - - 415
Remarks of the Editors on the election - 416
Extract from the N. Hampshire Gazette - ib
Do from the Louisiana Advertiser - ib
Do from the Albany Argus - - ib

No. 27—September 13, 1828.

A Maryland Farmer, to Joseph Gales, Esq. 417
Same to the same - - - 422
Same to the same - - - 423
Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, &c. to the people - - 427
Mr. Jefferson's opinions—Letter of Mr. Jefferson to J. B. Colvin - - ib
Mr. Ingersoll's observations on the passage of the resolutions expressive of the thanks of Congress to Gen. Jackson, &c. 428
Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, &c. to John Sergeant, Manuel Eyrie, &c.—Letter XIV - - 429
A caution—by the Editors - - 432
Extract of a letter on the subject of the six militiamen, &c. written by the son of a German in Tennessee, to his brother in Lebanon—from the American Sentinel, 432
Binns - - - - - ib
Important recipe - - - - ib

No. 28—September 20, 1828.

Committee of correspondence for Phila'd. &c. to John Sergeant, Manuel Eyrie, &c. letter XV. - - - - 433
Letter XVI. - - - - 435
Same to the Jackson committees of correspondence of Pennsylvania - - 438
Extracts of letters from committees of correspondence—Virginia - - 440
do N. York - - ib
do New Jersey - - ib
do Ohio - - 441
do Kentucky - - ib
do Missouri - ib
do Maryland - - ib
Committee of correspondence for Philad'a, &c. to John Sergeant, Manuel Eyrie, &c. letter XVII. - - - - ib
Same Committee to the same - - 444
Same to same—letter XVII. - - 445
The Post-master General - - - 448
Sign in Madison County, N. Y. - - ib

No. 29—September 27, 1828.

Mr. Adams' political character—from the N. York Evening Post - - - 449

Page.
Catullus, No. 1 - - - - 449
No. 2 - - - - 451
No. 3 - - - - 453
No. 4 - - - - 457
No. 5 - - - - 459
A damper - - - - - 461
An Enquirer - - - - 462
The vote of Pennsylvania—from the American Sentinel - - - 463
Extract from the Albany Argus - 464
Do from the Emporium - - ib

No. 30.—October 4, 1828.

Gen. Jackson at New Orleans - - 465
Mr. Jefferson to John B. Colvin, Esq. - ib
Gen. Jackson's answer to a rule to show cause why an attachment for contempt should not issue against him - - 466
Billy Black, Jr. - - - - 471
Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia, &c. to John Sergeant, Manuel Eyrie, &c.—Letter XIX. - - 472
Letter XX. - - - - 474
Mr. Clay - - - - - 476
John B. Derby to the Boston Statesman ib
Charge against Mr. Adams - - ib
Derby's affidavit - - - - 477
Townsend's do - - - - ib
Civil Chieftains—by Philo Plutarch - 479
Mr. Adams and Masonry—again - 480
Nathaniel Greene to E. Mack, Esq. - ib
Extract from the Boston Statesman - ib

No. 31.—October 11, 1828.

A statement of the evidence of facts and inferences deducible therefrom, by the Nashville Committee, in refutation of a charge in the public prints, imputing to Gen. Jackson a participation in the affair usually called Burr's conspiracy—from the Nashville Republican - - 481
Gen. Jackson to G. W. Campbell - 482
Campbell's certificate - - - ib
Extract of a letter from Gen. Jackson to the Hon. Daniel Smith, Senator in Congress - - - - - 483
Do do to Dr. Wm. Dickson, Representative in Congress - - - ib
Do do to Daniel Smith - - ib
Statement of John Coffee - - ib
Do of Edward Ward - - 484
Extracts from a letter of Col. Burr to Gen. Jackson - - - - 485
Extract of a publication of Judge Williams' 486
Theodorick Burton to the Editors of the Republican - - - - ib
Extract from the Impartial Review of December 13, 1806 - - - 488
Do from the Frankfort, (Ky.) Palladium ib
Appendix, No. 1.—Extract of a letter from Gen. James Robertson to the Hon. Daniel Smith - - 489
No. 2.—Extract of a letter from the same to Gen. D. Smith ib
No. 3.—Extract of a letter from Thomas Stuart, attorney, &c. to the same - - - - ib
No. 4.—Felix Robertson's statement - - - 490
No. 5.—Extract of a letter from Judge Williams to Mr. Kerr ib

Page.

Appendix, No. 6.—Gen. Jackson to Judge Williams - - - 491
No. 7.—Judge Williams' reply ib
No. 8.—Judge Williams' statement - - - ib
No. 9.—Judge Williams to the Sparta Review - - 492
No. 10.—Wm. Smith's statement - - - 493
No. 11.—Mr. Cuney's do 494
No. 13.—Willis Alston's do ib
No. 14.—Col. Hays' letter - 495
No. 15.—Letter of Mr. Graves ib
Characteristic anecdote - - - 495
Extract from the Hartford Times - 496

No. 32.—October 18, 1828.

Henry Clay and the bargain - - 497
Extract from Mr. Clay's address to his constituents - - - - 501
Do from his address, Dec. 1827 - ib
Do from Gen. Lafayette's letter to Mr Clay - - - - ib
Do from Mr. Clay's pamphlet of Dec. 1827 - - - - ib
Do from his second book, 1827 - ib
Do from his letter to Mr. Blair, as published by Mr. Kendall - - 503
Do from Mr. Clay's address to his constituents, April 1, 1825 - ib
Do from his second book, Dec. 1827 507
Do from his electioneering speech at Noble's, July, 1827 - - ib
Do from the same - - - ib
Mr. Adams and Masonry - - - 510

Page.

Adams and Masonry—once more - 511
Green & Jarvis to their subscribers - 512

No. 33.—October 28, 1828.

Important disclosure—remarks by the Editors - - - - - 513
Jonathan Russell to John P. Van Ness, Esq. ib
Letter from Mr. Clay to Mr. Russell - 518
Do Mr. Russell to Mr. Clay - 520
Appendix—Copy of a letter from James Lloyd to J. Adams, as contained in J. Q. Adams's book - - - - - 528

No. 34.—November 1, 1828.

Appendix to Russell's letter continned 529
Letter from James Lloyd to John Adams, continued - - - - ib
Letter from Jas. Lloyd to John Q. Adams, deposited in the Department of State 534
Letter from Mr. Russell to Mr. Crawford 541
Do Mr. Crawford to Mr. Russell 542
Do Mr. Russell to Mr. Crawford 543
Do Mr. Russell to Mr. Clay - 544

No. 35.—November 8, 1828.

Appendix to Russell's letter, continued - 545
Letter from Mr. Russell to Mr. Clay, continued - - - - - ib
Letter from H. Clay to Mr. Russell - 548
Do Mr. Russell to Mr. Clay - 550
Do Mr. Clay to Mr. Russell - 552

No. 36.—January 24, 1829.

Editor's Address to the Subscribers to the Extra Telegraph - - - 553
Presidential Elections—from 1789 to the present time, inclusive - - - 554

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 895 445 2